PRS-TAC-86-021

6 March 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-021

6 March 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: Gorbachev Statement 'Clearly' Defines Task
(Editorial; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 17 Jan 86)..... 1

USSR: Arms Initiative Expresses Soviet 'Spirit'
(Editorial; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 17 Jan 86)..... 4

PRAVDA Observer on Arms Proposals, SDI
(A. Baranov, P. Vedenyapin; Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 18 Jan 86)..... 7

USSR's Lt Gen Volkogonov Comments on Strategic Parity
(Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov; Moscow Domestic Service, 18 Jan 86)..... 9

USSR's Zagladin on Gorbachev Proposal in TuCP Congress Speech
(V. V. Zagladin, Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA, 19 Jan 86)..... 11

Moscow Views Congress' Attitude to Peace Initiatives
(Aleksandr Zholkver; Moscow Domestic Service, 20 Jan 86).. 13

Soviet Officials Discuss Aspects of Initiative
(Moscow TASS, 20 Jan 86; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 17 Jan 86)..... 14

Tolkunov on European View 14
SDI Program Must Stop, by Tom McMulland 15

USSR's Lomeyko Praises Soviet Disarmament Stand
(Vladimir Lomeyko; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 22 Jan 86)..... 16

USSR Examines U.S. Reactions to Gorbachev Initiative
(Various sources, various dates)..... 20

U.S. 'Hostility' Criticized, by V. Soldatov 20
U.S. Response Causes 'Mixed Feelings', by A. Palladin 21
Key Issues Avoided, by Bronislav Myakota 22
Politicians Must Take Stand, by Gennadiy Gerasimov 23
Specific Response Urged, by Igor Kudrin 24
U.S. 'Paying Lip Service', by Leonid Ponomarev 24
William Colby Cited, by Aleksandr Serikov 25
Reagan Avoids 'Key Question' 26
U.S. Actions Counter Proposal, by M. Ponomarev 26

USSR Continues To Await U.S. Response to Peace Offer
(Various sources, various dates)..... 30

'Cannot Be Brushed Aside', by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov 30
'Constructive' Response Urged, by Radomir Bogdanov 31
PRAVDA Editorial Article 32
World Awaits Response, by Vladimir Gerasichev 35
'Took Washington by Surprise', by G. Vasilyev 36
U.S. Resorts to Delaying Tactics, by Valentin Zorin 39
'Practical Deeds' Awaited, by Yuriy Kornilov 40
'Highly Conflicting Statements', by Valentin Zorin 41
Political Atmosphere 'Not Frozen', by Nikolay Shishlin 42

Moscow Patriarch Pimen Praises Gorbachev Peace Proposals
(Moscow TASS, 23 Jan 86)..... 44

Gorbachev Sends Messages To Explain Arms Proposals
(Moscow TASS, 24 Jan 86)..... 45

USSR: British, French Roles in Proposals Delineated
(Various sources, various dates)..... 46

'Practical Support' Needed, by Lev Semeyko 46
'Special Mission' for Europe, by Vladimir Chernyshev 47
Gorbachev Reportedly Asks Kohl's Support 48

Gorbachev Proposal Hailed in Soviet Army Paper Editorial
(KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 25 Jan 86)..... 50

TASS: Soviet Arms Proposal Seen as 'Blueprint' for Peace
(Moscow TASS, 26 Jan 86)..... 53

Shevardnadze Interviewed During Visit to Mongolia
(Moscow TASS, 26 Jan 86)..... 54

USSR: Soviet Proposal Termed a Realizable 'Dream'
(Fedor Burlatskiy; Moscow Television Service, 26 Jan 86). 58

USSR's 'Top Priority' Program Examines Nuclear Disarmament
(Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow to North America,
27 Jan 86)..... 60

Disarmament Talks Begin; Possibilities Assessed
(Various sources, various dates)..... 64

Israelyan Focuses on CW 64
Israelyan Press Conference 65
Success Depends on U.S. 67

Gorbachev's Proposals Discussed During Visit by Italy's Natta
(Moscow TASS, 28 Jan 86)..... 69

Natta Meets With Gorbachev 69
Gorbachev Addresses Dinner 70
Natta Speaks at Dinner 72

Argentine Foreign Minister's Visit Reported
(Various sources, various dates)..... 74

Shevardnadze Speaks at Luncheon 74
Caputo Speech Reported 74
Gromyko, Caputo Talk 75
Bilateral Relations Discussed 75
Press Conference Held 76
More on Meeting With Gromyko 77

USSR: NATO 'Attempts To Discredit' Soviet Initiatives
(Viktor Levin; Moscow Domestic Service, 29 Jan 86)..... 79

USSR: Gorbachev Statement Provides Alternative to Arms
(Fedor Burlatskiy; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA,
29 Jan 86)..... 80

Soviet, U.S. Disarmament Policies Contrasted by TASS Observer
(Yuriy Kornilov; Moscow Domestic Service, 30 Jan 86)..... 84

U.S. Attitude to Arms Package Examined
(Mikhail Ozerov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 31 Jan 86)... 87

TASS: NATO's Gen Rogers Opposed to Gorbachev Initiative
(Nikolay Setunskiy; Moscow TASS, 1 Feb 86)..... 89

USSR's Gromyko Receives Vance, Discusses Relations, Proposals
(Moscow TASS, 3 Feb 86; Moscow Domestic Service,
4 Feb 86)..... 90

Proposals 'Impress' Vance 90
Proposals 'Center of Conversation', by Aleksandr Zholkver 91

USSR's 'Top Priority' Program on 'Willingness' in Arms Control
(Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow to North America,
3 Feb 86)..... 93

Soviet Experts Evaluate New Arms Initiative
(Moscow to North America, 4 Feb 86)..... 97

U.S. Senator Kennedy Meets With Soviet Officials in Moscow
(Moscow TASS, 5, 6 Feb 86; Moscow Television Service,
6, 9 Feb 86)..... 100

Soviet Parliamentary Group 100
Shevardnadze Receives Kennedy 101
Gorbachev Receives Kennedy 101
Kennedy Addresses Academy 102
Academician Aleksandrov Speaks 103
Kennedy Speaks on Moscow TV 104
Kennedy, Zorin Discuss Visit 107

USSR's Kobysh, Primakov Discuss Gorbachev Initiatives
(Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 5 Feb 86)..... 110

Gorbachev Offer Examined; May Signal Breakthrough
(David Adamson; London DAILY TELEGRAPH, 30 Jan 86)..... 118

Soviet Commentary on Reagan State of the Union Address
(Various sources, various dates)..... 120

TASS Cites PRAVDA Editorial 120
Speech Dwells on SDI, by G. Zubkov 121
No Comment on Arms Proposal, by Aleksandr Zholkver 122
Listeners 'Disappointed' 123

TASS: U.S. Congressman Urges Progress on Arms Talks
(Moscow TASS, 9 Feb 86)..... 125

Soviet Scientists Appeal to U.S. Colleagues
(Moscow PRAVDA, 9 Feb 86)..... 126

Briefs

Gorbachev Statement Released at UN	128
Delhi Statement on Proposal at UN	128
NEW YORK TIMES Carries Gorbachev Statement	128
Consultations in Hague on Initiative	128
Shevardnadze, Hartman Discuss Arms Proposals	129

USSR: GORBACHEV STATEMENT 'CLEARLY' DEFINES TASKS

PM171042 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Toward a World Without Weapons"]

[Text] The United Nations has proclaimed the new year of 1986 peace year. What must be done to ensure it really does become a turning point in international relations and clears the way to ending the nuclear arms race on earth, preventing it in space, generally reducing the danger of war, and establishing trust among states? The answer to this question is given in the recently adopted CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Soviet Government decision on a number of major foreign policy actions of a principled nature. The essence of the Soviet peace initiatives is contained in the just published statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The concrete Soviet proposals clearly define the aims, methods, machinery, and time scale for achieving comprehensive disarmament. The task is posed, above all, of freeing the planet from nuclear weapons by the beginning of the 21st century. The Soviet Union has advanced a practical program for curtailing nuclear arsenals -- both vehicles and charges -- down to their total liquidation.

In the first stage, over the course of 5-8 years, the Soviet Union and the United States are to halve their nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory and each will retain no more than 6,000 charges on the remaining carriers. It is also proposed to liquidate the Soviet and U.S. medium-range ballistic and cruise missiles in the European zone. These means must not be transferred to other countries and Britain and France must pledge not to build up their own corresponding arms. At the same time the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms must be resolutely banned.

Not later than 1990 it is necessary to begin the second stage, which will last for 5-7 years and during which other nuclear powers will begin to join the Soviet and U.S. disarmament measures in order to undertake a radical step through joint efforts -- to liquidate tactical nuclear weapons.

The Soviet-U.S. accord on banning space strike arms must evolve into a multilateral accord with the obligatory participation of the leading industrial countries. Then a reliable obstacle should be erected to the creation [sozdaniye] of combat systems which are based on new physical principles and which approximate means of mass destruction in terms of their strike abilities.

Finally, the third stage, calculated through 1999, draws the line -- the remaining nuclear weapons are liquidated once and for all and a universal accord is drawn up so that they are never revived again. In other words, the Damoclean sword of nuclear destruction, which has been threatening all mankind since 1945, will be removed.

What does the Soviet program's adoption give to the disarmament process? For some people in the West claim that accords in this sphere are quite unattainable. "The thing is that the two blocs, which by no means adhere to one and the same philosophy, cannot talk the same language," French Professor M. (Felden) writes. "They have quite different ways of thinking and values and do not adhere to the same criteria in their arguments; the result is almost total lack of understanding." There is no denying that our philosophy, our modes of thought, and many of our values are different. But our goals and criteria in the cause of achieving disarmament must be common goals and criteria. Strictly speaking, they are enshrined in a number of international documents, including Soviet-U.S. documents. Nuclear war must not be permitted -- there can be no victors. Accords can only be reached if the principle of equality and identical security is strictly observed. These are fundamental tenets! There is also the experience of conducting talks which have ended with the signing of very important agreements. Suffice it to cite the Soviet-U.S. ABM, SALT I, and SALT II treaties. That is to say that pessimism is being deliberately fueled by certain circles in the West; so as to prevent disarmament.

The latest Soviet proposals, which have provoked an unprecedented international response, open up huge possibilities. They envisage special procedures for destroying nuclear weapons and for dismantling, reequipping, or scrapping delivery vehicles. Our country is prepared to adopt any necessary measures of verification, including on-site inspections. If adopted, the Soviet program would lend the disarmament dialogue purposiveness and purposefulness and make it possible to break the dangerous tendency whereby the pace of the arms race outstrips the results of talks.

M.S. Gorbachev's statement draws special attention to the need to ban nuclear tests. As is known, as of 6 August last year the Soviet Union introduced a moratorium on nuclear explosions. Moscow repeatedly appealed to Washington to reciprocate. But no positive response was forthcoming. "By exploding ever new nuclear devices the U.S. side continues to pursue the unrealizable dream of military superiority," M.S. Gorbachev notes. "This is a fruitless and dangerous policy. A policy unworthy of the level of civilization which contemporary society has reached." Now, the Soviet Union has adopted another important decision. It has extended its moratorium by 3 months. The U.S. Administration has enough time to weigh our proposals and follow the Soviet Union's example. After all, halting nuclear tests means halting the endless refinement of nuclear weapons and leads to the actual freezing and ultimate liquidation of their stockpiles. That is why the Soviet Union once more calls on the United States to embark on the path of judicious and responsible decisions.

In order to ensure that the program to cut and reduce nuclear arsenals to naught is implemented consistently and effectively, the highest possible effectiveness of the machinery of disarmament -- bilateral and multilateral talks -- must be ensured. This applies primarily to the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, the fourth round of which has started in Geneva. When they began their dialogue at the beginning of last year the sides determined its subject matter and aims: not to start an arms race in space, to halt it on earth, and to get down to the radical reduction of nuclear weapons, making their complete liquidation the ultimate task.

During the November meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan this line was reaffirmed in the joint statement which stressed the mutual desire to speed up the work at the talks.

The Soviet delegation which has arrived in Geneva has received instructions to conduct matters in strict accordance with this agreement. We expect just such a constructive approach from the United States also, primarily on the question of the nonmilitarization of space.

The package of Soviet initiatives embraces a wide range of disarmament and security problems. These include the question of banning and liquidating stocks of chemical ammunition. They include the tasks involved in reducing conventional weapons and armed forces in Central Europe, which are being discussed at the Vienna talks. They also include the confidence-building measures being discussed at the Stockholm conference. Ensuring security in Asia is also of vitally important significance for the Soviet Union as one of the major Asian powers.

Our new proposals are addressed to the whole world. The urgent need to implement them requires the efforts of all countries and peoples. Here the contribution of every person is important. "The course of peace and disarmament has been and will be the pivot of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state," M.S. Gorbachev stresses in the statement. "In actively pursuing this course, the Soviet Union is prepared to cooperate broadly with all who act from positions of reason, goodwill, and awareness of responsibility for ensuring mankind's future -- without wars or weapons."

The resolute actions to protect peace and improve the international atmosphere taken by the Soviet Union attest once again to the organic and indissoluble continuity of Soviet domestic and foreign policy. Our creative plans, with which we are approaching the 27th CPSU Congress, and the course of accelerating our peaceful construction are confirmed and developed in constructive initiatives in the international arena. There is where our great strength and confidence in the future lie!

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

USSR: ARMS INITIATIVE EXPRESSES SOVIET 'SPIRIT'

PM171156 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jan 86 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Program of Peace and Humanism"]

[Text] The entire world is now witnessing the Soviet Union yet again raising aloft the banner of peace, freedom, and humanism which Great October hoisted over the planet. This is how Soviet people, our friends abroad, all progressive mankind, and all the sober-minded people of the globe received the statement published yesterday in the press by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the passionate appeal in it to strive for a breakthrough for the better in the international arena. This document is of immense political importance. It discusses how to maintain peace and how to eliminate the threat of nuclear war.

It is this goal that is pursued by the decision made by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Soviet Government at the very beginning of the year on a number of major foreign policy actions of a principled nature. Their purport is to promote to the greatest possible extent the improvement of the international situation. They are dictated by the need to overcome the negative and confrontational trends that have arisen in recent years and to clear the way for ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in space, ensuring an overall reduction in the war danger, and building trust as an inalienable component of relations among states.

What is the Soviet Union offering? What measures is it putting forward for improving the situation on our planet?

First and foremost, a specific program intended for the total elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide within a precisely defined period of time. Acting progressively and consistently, its essence is to implement and complete within the next 15 years -- that is, before the end of this century -- the process of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons. The program is not only being announced. It contains a comprehensively conceived and well-founded procedure for reducing nuclear arms -- both delivery vehicles and charges -- right up to their complete elimination.

In the first phase it is envisaged that in 5-8 years the Soviet Union and the United States will halve the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories and each side will not retain more than 6,000 charges on their remaining launch vehicles. Naturally, this reduction is only possible given a joint renunciation by both powers of the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. The decision to completely eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles -- both ballistic and cruise -- in the European zone as a first step toward ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons is to be reached and implemented at this stage.

In the second phase, which should commence no later than 1990 and last 5-7 years, the other nuclear powers will start to join in nuclear disarmament. After the Soviet Union and the United States complete reducing their relevant arms by 50 percent, yet another radical step is to be taken: all the nuclear powers will scrap tactical nuclear weapons, that is, means with a range (operating radius) of up to 1,000 km. The third phase, during which the elimination of all remaining nuclear arms will be completed, will start no later than 1995.

Thus, by the end of 1999 there will be no nuclear weapons left on earth. By then a universal accord will have been worked out to ensure that these weapons never reappear.

The proposals in M.S. Gorbachev's statement regarding the elimination of nuclear weapons on earth are of epoch-making importance. They envisage mankind entering the 3d millennium without nuclear weapons on the basis of mutually acceptable and strictly verifiable accords. Instead of spending the next 10-15 years on creating [sozdaniye] new weapons in space that are extremely dangerous for all the peoples and which, as Washington tries to allege, are intended to make nuclear arms unnecessary, it is more sensible to tackle the destruction of those arms and ultimately, reduce them to zero. It is this path that the Soviet Union is proposing. The problem of eliminating nuclear weapons is of importance for all mankind. It can and must be resolved only jointly. And the faster the new Soviet program is translated into the language of practical actions, the safer life on our planet will be.

Other radical measures according with the aspirations of all mankind are also envisaged. Striving to take a practical step in the context of nuclear disarmament, the Soviet Union has made an important decision: to extend its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which expired 31 December 1985, by 3 months. This moratorium, the Soviet Union states, will remain in force even longer if the United States for its part also ends nuclear tests. "Since last summer," M.S. Gorbachev points out, "we have been calling on the United States to follow our example and end nuclear explosions. Hitherto, Washington has not done this despite protests and demands from the public and against the will of most states. In exploding more and more nuclear devices the U.S. side is continuing to chase the impossible dream of military superiority. This is a fruitless and dangerous policy; a policy unworthy of the level of civilization that present-day society has reached."

Bold, new approaches, new political thinking, and recognition of its responsibility for the peoples' destiny determine the Soviet Union's other proposals also.

It believes it necessary to put the entire existing system of talks into motion and to ensure that disarmament mechanisms are as highly efficient as possible. It is also a question of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, where the achievement in practice of tangible results would mean filling the program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 with weighty material content. It is also a question, in the Soviet opinion, of the entirely realistic task of totally eliminating in this century such barbaric mass destruction weapons as chemical weapons. And the Soviet Union advocates not only the rapid and total elimination of these weapons, but also of their industrial manufacturing base -- under strict monitoring, including international on-site verification.

The Soviet Union firmly stands for the agreed reductions in conventional arms and armed forces, of which an accord at the Vienna talks could mark the start. Possibilities have emerged for reaching mutually acceptable decisions at the Stockholm

Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. It is of vitally great importance to ensure security in Asia and resolve the increasingly acute global problems that mankind is encountering.

Thus, the range of new foreign policy initiatives proposed by the Soviet Union is aimed at ensuring that mankind greets the year 2000 under a peaceful sky and space, saving it from fearing a nuclear, chemical, or any other threat of destruction and ensuring that it is firmly confident of the survival and continuation of the human race.

The Soviet people see the new, resolute actions by the CPSU and the Soviet Government in defense of peace and improving the entire international situation as an expression of the spirit of Soviet domestic and foreign policy, of their organic cohesion, and of the fundamental historic law emphasized by V.I. Lenin. Soviet working people express total approval for the new peace initiatives of the CPSU and the Soviet State and state their resolve to strengthen their beloved fatherland's might through their selfless labor. Their voices are joined by those of army and navy servicemen who vigilantly stand guard over our motherland's security and are preparing to greet the 27th Congress of the Leninist Communist Party with new successes in improving combat training and increasing vigilance and combat readiness.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

PRAVDA OBSERVER ON ARMS PROPOSALS, SDI

PM211534 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jan 86 pp 1, 3

[A. Baranov and P. Vedenyapin report under the rubric "Direct Line": "The Earth Is Our Common Home. Vsevolod Vladimirovich Ovchinnikov, PRAVDA political observer and USSR state prize winner, conducts a dialogue with readers"]

[Excerpts] [Reader Yelena Lerskaya] Hello, Vsevolod Vladimirovich. My name is Yelena Lerskaya. I am a Muscovite, and I work as a scientific staffer at a research institute.

[Ovchinnikov] Good morning, Yelena.

[Lerskaya] I would like to discuss with you a problem that interests me. As is well known, the United States did not follow the USSR's call to proclaim a moratorium on nuclear explosions. This is not the first peace initiative by our country to fail to meet with a positive response across the ocean. Does this not mean that we are making certain concessions to Washington by assuming unilateral pledges?

[Ovchinnikov] Of course, the very fact of the introduction of the moratorium required daring and a certain amount of risk, like any unilateral steps in the military sphere. It seems to me, however, that you are not quite right to say that we are following a policy of concessions to the United States. In international relations it is sometimes necessary to make a compromise if the objective justifies this. I also think that in this instance the positive influence exerted by our steps on the world public and on U.S. political circles is in itself a factor of considerable importance.

Moreover, as M.S. Gorbachev noted in his statement, "...the stakes are too great and the degree of responsibility too high for us not to explore all opportunities for influencing the stance of others by force of example."

[Lerskaya] Thank you, Vsevolod Vladimirovich. Good-bye.

[Reader Georgiy Zavgorodnev] Good morning, Vsevolod Vladimirovich. My name is Georgiy Fedorovich Zavgorodnev. I am a war veteran living in Volgograd.

[Ovchinnikov] Hello, Georgiy Fedorovich.

[Zavgorodnev] I want to ask your view on the following question. The United States is intensively implementing the SDI program, claiming that it will make strategic offensive missiles unnecessary. Is this really so?

[Ovchinnikov] The simplest way to make strategic offensive missiles unnecessary is to abandon them, to reduce their numbers by one-half initially, and then to proceed step by step toward their complete elimination. This is exactly what the USSR proposes. We are against the "star wars" program precisely because it will lead not to a reduction but to a sharp increase in offensive nuclear arms. As you know, at present the two sides have almost 10,000 warheads each. Thus, even if the "space shield" guarantees 99-percent defense, just 1 percent will be sufficient to destroy the other country's major cities.

In practice, therefore, the program can be conceived only for the purpose of delivering a first strike in order to destroy a considerable part of the Soviet strategic potential and weaken the counterstrike by means of antimissiles. There are, however, other reasons why we are against this program. After all, missiles intended to destroy missiles can also be used to hit any other targets both in space and on earth, in other words, they can also be used for offensive purposes. As you know, we have said that if we fail to convince the United States of the absurdity and danger of the "Strategic Defense Initiative's" implementation, the Soviet Union will find a less expensive and sufficiently effective response.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

USSR'S LT GEN VOLKOGONOV COMMENTS ON STRATEGIC PARITY

LD182158 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 18 Jan 86

[Commentary by Lieutenant General Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov: "A Guarantee of Peace"]

[Text] We will devote our talk today to military-strategic parity, sometimes called balance, between the Soviet Union and the United States, the Warsaw Pact and NATO. As never before the destinies of the preservation of peace have proved to be closely linked with the possibilities which the Soviet Union and its allies have at their disposal for their defense. The greatest guarantees of security in the face of the militarist challenge now lie in the ability of socialism to maintain military-strategic parity. In the draft new revised edition of our party's program, its establishment is evaluated as a historic achievement of socialism. The equality in strategic forces has strengthened the position of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries and has upset the hopes of the aggressive circles of imperialism for a victory in a nuclear war.

Preserving this balance is a substantial guarantee for safeguarding peace and international security, the party document stresses. Defense of socialism proceeds from a most important political premise: maintaining the Armed Forces at a level which rules out the strategic superiority of imperialism. Otherwise, this would be tantamount to encouraging the aggressor, who in the past few years alone has drawn up many scenarios for achieving, as he puts it, a decisive military victory. In the opinion of the planners from the Pentagon bunkers, the model of war which continues to be the most advantageous to them is that which is limited to the territory of West Europe and the Soviet Union, leaving the United States basically untouched. And this, in the view of the U.S. military department, can be achieved when the United States' nuclear missile forces in Europe are such that a considerable part of the Soviet Union's containment potential can be directed against them.

But today this already seems to little for them. As is known, the hawks in Washington are connecting special hopes with the so-called SDI whose essence boils down to creating such a space strike system as will ensure the possibility of inflicting a first strike on the enemy and, to all intents and purposes, of not permitting a counterstrike or at least sharply reducing the power of such a counterstrike. The war hawks in no way wish to understand that in the end we shall not permit their unilateral advantages either on earth or in space.

Pursuit of the unrealizable dream of military superiority, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his statement on a program for the elimination of nuclear weapons on the planet, is a fruitless and dangerous policy. If only they understood this immutable truth, our country's historic constructive proposals for a mutual reduction of the level of the strategic balance in stages right up the elimination of nuclear weapons, could become the basis for cardinal changes for the better on the planet. And as long as this has not happened, the ability of socialism to maintain relative strengths in the form of parity — which through the fault of the Americans are at a very high level today — gives those chief material guarantees of security which serve the entire world. And here one has to take into account that the Soviet strategic forces are intended — both because of our peace-loving course and obligations not to be first to use nuclear weapons — only for a counterstrike, while the U.S. ones are intended for first strike. It is therefore that the thinking of the U.S.strategists is such that in evaluations, conclusions, and especially in talks, they are operating with their own categories which are unacceptable for real accords. Today, a potential aggressor must know that he can attempt to destroy an enemy by means of nuclear weapons — by the way, Washington's SDI precisely testifies that pursuit of the ephemeral but dangerous specter of decisive superiority is continuing — but he is also just as defenseless in a retaliatroy crushing blow. In the Pentagon's bunkers they in no way want to agree with the imperious demand of the nuclear age. Real security now lies not in the search for ways of achieving victory in a war but in the guaranteed capability of preventing a nuclear cataclysm. And the foundation of such an prevention lies in the strategic galance of nuclear forces.

In the post-war years, imperialism, as is known, has unleashed some 100 local wars and armed conflicts, and has repeatedly placed the world on the verge of a dangerous confrontation, and has conducted global exercises of offensive strategic nuclear forces — for example, of the "Global Shield" type, with many hundreds of bombers carrying nuclear weapons onboard taking to the air and with the targeting of a multitude of missile complexes at real targets. Many of these wars could become the detonators of a large war and provocative exercises can be a prelude to an all-out attack on the Soviet Union and its allies.

But the real might of socialism and its political resolve to defend its gains are forcing the militarists each time to refrain from a nuclear adventure. Parity, balance, the approximate equality of strategic nuclear forces is a mighty restraining factor and a kind of bastion against war. Here I would like to stress that maintaining military-strategic parity is not only the business of designers, of our industry, of the higher operational link of the Army and Navy. This balance is nothing other than the ability of each soldier, each serviceman to carry out his duty to the end, their skill and craftsmanship multiplied by ardent patriotism and irreconcilability toward the enemy. The most complicated military system depends on the full execution of service obligations by each servicemen. For this reason it can be said that today virtually each soldier, sergeant, sergeant-major, officer has a part in dealing with the strategic tasks to safeguard the security of the fatherland.

And one more fundamental observation: While maintaining military-strategic parity in nuclear weapons, there cannot be any question of parity in spiritual forces. We have had, have, and will have moral superiority over the personnel of the imperialist armies. This superiority is expressed in the invincible strength of our ideology, the great fairness of our ideals, the immense advantage of the socialist way of life, and the high moral-political qualities of the man who wears an army or navy greatcoat. On the quality of service and the execution of duty by this man, and speaking precisely, by each serviceman, depends the dearest thing we have — the destiny of our fatherland.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

USSR'S ZAGLADIN ON GORBACHEV PROPOSAL IN TuCP CONGRESS SPEECH

PM291730 Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 19 Jan 86 pp 1, 3

[Unattributed account of speech by V.V. Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, delivered 17 January at 23d Turkmen Communist Party Congress]

[Excerpt] Comrades!

In such speeches it is customary first of all to speak about internal affairs and then to broach problems of international politics. However, I think today that it is expedient to violate this procedure. First of all because enhanced attention to international affairs has become an important feature of the activity of the Central Committee and of its general secretary since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) plenum. This attention is, I would say, innovative. The activity of the Central Committee at this time is characterized by a desire to get the world situation moving from a standstill and to ensure real forward progression along the path toward the solution of the chief international problem — the problem of averting the danger of nuclear war which is threatening mankind.

Secondly, it is also expedient to turn first of all to issues of international life because just now, literally on the eve of your congress, our party launched bold, new, and — it can be said without exaggeration — ambitious intitiatives of a foreign policy nature. I mean the statement which M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee delivered on 15 January. This statement expounds proposals whose implementation could — and not just in our opinion, but in the opinion of broad sections of the world's public — lead to a most radical turnaround in the course of world events.

The contents of the statement are known to you. The main feature is that our party proposes that all nuclear weapons and also chemical weapons be banned and eliminated even before the start of the new millennium — under strict international control, of course. It is clear that all this is possible only if space strike weapons are totally renounced. This is a fundamentally necessary prerequisite for progress in the matter of guaranteeing real security of the peoples.

These initiatives of ours are a direct practical embodiment of the guidelines of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) plenum for the utmost activation of our foreign policy, and of the propositions of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program. In the world arena our country holds the initiative firmly in its hands.

There is no doubt that aggressive circles in Washington and other western capitals will do all they can to retard the implementation of our ideas. They will, however, find that very difficult. It will be difficult because the Soviet Union's proposals take most fully into account the interests and demands of all countries and peoples, and accord with the hopes of all mankind.

A struggle lies ahead. Our country and our party are ready for that struggle. The Communist Parties, revolutionary democrats, many social democratic parties, and realistically minded statesmen of many countries are now calling for that struggle. A broad and truly worldwide front of struggle for the implementation of the Soviet initiatives is being created.

And although this struggle will not be easy, and although a long road has yet to be traversed, the very fact that our new initiatives have been launched has already exerted a salutary influence on the international atmosphere. What we have dubbed "the spirit of Geneva" following M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with President Reagan, has now acquired a solid, reliable foundation. confidence in our policy is growing everywhere. On the other hand, the mendacious myth about a Soviet military threat — a myth which is being propagandized in order to justify the arms race and preparations for war — is gradually melting away like snow in spring.

An important place in our international work is occupied by efforts aimed at eliminating the armed conflicts which exist on earth. Our aim is to achieve a solution to these conflicts by peaceful means, through negotations. This also applies to the problems of your neighbor, Afghanistan, and to the Iran-Iraq war. We have already done a great deal in this direction and much more will be done in the immediate future [v blizhaysheye vremya].

We have already spoken of the fact that the implementation of our proposals will require earnest and vigorous foreign policy activity. This is undoubtedly so. But, comrades, I must also say something else: The outcome of this struggle depends very much on how we shall work here at home.

From textbooks we all know very well that foreign and domestic policy in any country are closely interconnected. But if one is to talk of the Soviet Union then this interconnection acquires, if you like, special significance. I shall clarify what I have said by some examples. In the early seventies imperialism was forced to make the move from cold war to detente. Why? Because the Soviet Union had managed, on the basis of its economic achievements, to acquire military-strategic parity with the United States. This caused many hotheads in Washington and in the West in general to come to their senses.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

Then, in the mid-seventies the brief detente gave way to confrontation. Why did imperialism take this turn? There were various reasons but one of them was that economic difficulties in the socialist countries, including in the Soviet Union, were perceived in the West, and above all in the United States. And they thought: Now we can apply the "squeeze" and force the Communists to capitulate.

But at the end of 1985 the Americans suddenly decided on a meeting between President Reagan and M.S. Gorbachev, and on the signing of a statement which contains exceptionally important proposals which are well known to you. Why then did the United States venture such a step as Geneva? Not least because they noticed that things were going better in the Soviet Union and that our development had begun to accelerate again.

MOSCOW VIEWS CONGRESS' ATTITUDE TO PEACE INITIATIVES

LD202349 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Jan 85

[Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] As has already been reported, the USSR Supreme Soviet has appealed to the U.S. Congress in connection with the new peace initiatives set out in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

The role of the U.S. Congress in the structure of the upper echelons of power in the United States is of no little importance. Suffice to recall that both chambers in Congress confirm the U.S. federal budget which specifically provides for appropriations, including the major ones, for all kinds of military programs from the production and testing of nuclear weapons to the development [razrabotka] of space weapons. Nevertheless, quite a few voices have been heard and are being heard both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, pointing out the danger and ruinous nature of the arms race -- particularly if it is to be transferred to space too.

The Supreme Soviet has now appealed to the U.S. Congress with a call to select in the end the only reasonable alternative: To put up a lasting barrier to the arms race both on earth and in space. The USSR has for the first time in the history of the nuclear age put forward a detailed and specific program that has a precisely calculated period -- for the coming 15 years -- for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere. The supreme legislative body of our country is also suggesting to the U.S. parliament that a joint movement toward this aim be begun immediately.

What should be done first of all? We think that the cessation of nuclear testing would be the first practical step. As far as I know, this point of view is also held by a number of U.S. congressmen. Incidentally, many of them in this respect are taking into account the upcoming elections to Congress in the fall where the chances of the candidates will to a considerable extent depend on their attitude to the demand for a halt to nuclear explosions that has become widespread in the country.

As you know, our country has unilaterally extended the moratorium on all nuclear explosions for another 3 months. The Supreme Soviet is calling upon the United States to follow our example and not to block any further the implementation of a most significant task for the whole of mankind. We will hope that the U.S. congressmen too will raise their voices to put an end to the madness of the nuclear race.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

SOVIET OFFICIALS DISCUSS ASPECTS OF INITIATIVE

Tolkunov on European View

LD210011 Moscow TASS in English 2106 GMT 20 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 20 TASS -- "Europe can and should fulfil a special mission -- to build a new edifice of detente. It is a firmly held view of the Soviet public that this idea formulated in the recent statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will gain strong backing of the nations of Europe," Lev Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Security and Cooperation in Europe, told a TASS correspondent.

It is not happenstance, he went on, that a considerable part of the new Soviet initiatives aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war and establishing a durable peace is addressed directly to Europe. Through the fault of imperialist quarters it is literally stuffed with nuclear weapons. There are about 7,000 U.S. nuclear munitions in Western Europe, not to mention British and French systems. Nuclear-armed aircraft carriers and guided missile submarines of the U.S. permanently cruise on the seas and oceans surrounding the continent.

However, Western strategists think that all this is not enough to counter the alleged Soviet "military threat", Lev Tolkunov went on to say. The deployment of U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles continues in NATO countries. The total number of these missiles stationed in Great Britain, West Germany, Italy and Belgium, according to Washington's official figures, has already reached 140.

"In that explosive situation our country," Lev Tolkunov stressed, proposes to get rid of nuclear arsenals, to cut the Gordian knot. The Europeans will see a realistic posibility for the complete elimination -- as early as at the first stage of implementation of the U.S.S.R.-proposed plan -- of the intermediate-range missiles of the Soviet Union and the U.S. in the European zone as a first step toward ridding the continent of nuclear weapons completely."

The U.S.S.R., Lev Tolkunov stressed, "shows an example that efforts to eliminate the threat of nuclear war should make themselves felt above all in concrete steps promoting disarmament. We urge the people of goodwill, our partners abroad, public organizations, political parties, scientific and educational establishments to study Soviet proposals carefully and express their attitude to them."

"Our committee and members of the Soviet public who support if express the readiness to take part in joint and parallel actions of all peace forces with a view to bringing about a sharp turn from the policy of military confrontation to the policy of peace, goodneighborliness and cooperation," Lev Tolkunov emphasized.

SDI Program Must Stop

LD171707 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1610 GMT 17 Jan 86

[By Tom Mcmulland, PA diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] President Reagan must halt the "star wars" programme if Soviet proposals for ridding the world of nuclear weapons are to proceed, a senior official at the Soviet Embassy in London said today.

The Soviet leader Mr Mikhail Gorbachev this week suggested scrapping all nuclear weapons by the year 2000. A press conference was called at the Soviet Embassy to explain the background to Mr Gorbachev's proposals, which have been welcomed by Mr Reagan. In London, the Foreign Office said the suggestions contained some new elements and were being studied.

Mr Guennadi Chabannikov, press attache at the embassy, said the Soviet Union could not accept the testing, development and deployment of "star wars" technology. "It will ruin any efforts in the field of nuclear disarmament.

"You cannot do the two things together," he said. "We see no reason for the deployment of outer space strike weapons while everyone is engaged in the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. It is said that the outer space strike weapons will make nuclear weapons obsolete or useless. Why such a complicated way of doing things?'

Mr Chabannikov indicated, however, that even without a U.S. commitment to abandon its "star wars" proposals the Soviets were still ready to negotiate on intermediate range nuclear weapons. He said Mr Gorbachev's proposals are likely to be discussed when a Soviet deputy foreign minister Mr Nikita Ryzhkov visits London next week, even though the visit is meant to deal mainly with bilateral issues.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

USSR'S LOMEYKO PRAISES SOVIET DISARMAMENT STAND

PM301251 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Jan 86 p 14

[Vladimir Lomeyko "Political Commentary": "Toward a Nuclear-Free Civilization: Reflections on the Planet's Present and Future" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] If you ponder on the nature and ways of implementing the 15-year program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons from our planet and listen carefully to the many-voiced echo of the planet itself, which is tired of its nuclear fetters, you can sense how truly the mood of the world has been caught. A CHANGE FOR THE BETTER IS NEEDED. And that means real, concrete measures to overcome the spirit of confrontation, clear away the heaps of nuclear weapons, banish the fear which is gnawing away at mankind, and restore people's shattered confidence. It is acknowledged everywhere -- frankly and openly, aloud and sincerely by most people, in an undertone by some, and against their will by others (but even that is a sign that things cannot be otherwise) -- that Moscow has expressed the product of long suffering, urgency, and desire, has expressed what torments and alarms everyone, regardless of ideology, race, or religion.

...I am reminded of a poster which I saw many years ago at a congress of the German Peace Union in Bochum, with Arnold Zweig's words: "Just as someone once started war, someone must start peace."

In order to start peace in our nuclear age, which has stopped believing in vows of peaceability and is corrupted by increasingly sophisticated methods of killing people, you need will and courage. And you also need the ability to rise above political and ideological contradictions and look beyond current disagreements in order to see new horizons, new shores of cooperation.

To do this, it is very important to rise above national egotism, tactical calculations, disputes, and dissensions, whose significance is negligible in comparison with the preservation of our main asset -- peace and a safe future.

All this has been not only proclaimed, but demonstrated in practice by the Soviet Union in its appeal to all peoples and governments to embark this very year, 1986, on ridding the earth of nuclear weapons in stages.

In a report from Geneva the U.S. television company CBS noted: "After hearing the details of the new Soviet proposal, one member of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks stated that in their totality they make a STUNNING IMPRESSION."

That assessment is understandable, because for many disarmament experts the Soviet statement sounded like a call for the start of a nuclear-free world. What is STUNNING is the very spirit, the very philosophy of a new way of looking at the world: not to compete to create new types of weapons of mass destruction, but to work toward their total elimination.

The proposed program is also STUNNING.

IN THE FIRST STAGE the Soviet Union and the United States stop all nuclear explosions, they halve the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory in the course of 5-8 years, and they renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. The Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone are also completely eliminated. The United States does not deliver its strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries. Britain and France do not build up their respective nuclear arms.

IN THE SECOND STAGE the Soviet Union and the United States continue the reductions on which they agreed in the first stage and carry out further measures to eliminate their medium-range nuclear arms and freeze their tactical nuclear means.

The other nuclear powers freeze all their nuclear arms and do not have such arms on other countries' territories; they stop testing nuclear weapons. All the nuclear powers eliminate tactical nuclear weapons. Multilateral commitments are adopted on banning space strike arms and banning the creation of non-nuclear arms on new physical principles.

IN THE THIRD STAGE the elimination of all the remaining nuclear arms is completed. A universal accord is elaborated to ensure that these weapons are never revived.

It is precisely because this is a problem of significance to all mankind, that we can and must resolve only together, that the Soviet Union has submitted to the whole world a three-stage route for the ascent to the heights of a nuclear-free civilization. This matter is too important, too vitally important to all peoples, to be left to armchair experts. And people who try to see this as a propagandist ploy are only confirming their own inability to rise above the old, narrow way of thinking and their own self-interest.

Some people across the ocean were inclined to take offense: We, they say, were the first to call for the elimination of nuclear weapons. But you cannot erase the scar of the nuclear burn from history's memory: The United States was the first to make and the first to use nuclear weapons. And the Soviet Union raised the question of banning the production and use of nuclear weapons and the use of nuclear power for peaceful purposes for the good of all mankind as early as 1946.

But to this day we place the emphasis not on settling scores, but on acting together to eliminate the nuclear threat. That was why Moscow proclaimed a moratorium from 6 August through 31 December 1985 on all nuclear explosions. UNILATERALLY. And on 15 January this year, despite the fact that the United States has still not joined the moratorium, the Soviet Union decided to EXTEND FOR A FURTHER 3 MONTHS its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

That also belongs to the category of STUNNING facts for those who are in the grip of the old way of thinking in terms of strength and the desire for superiority. We had

every moral right not to extend the moratorium. But we did so, placing the interests of all mankind above our own right, in the hope of trying one more time. Does this step not amount to a unilateral declaration of peace in the age of nuclear confrontation? Here the United States could cast aside ambition and tactical calculations and be the first of the nuclear powers to follow the Soviet Union's example. I do not think anyone's national interests would suffer in the slightest, and international security could only gain.

Is the impressive task put forward by the Soviet Union of completely eliminating nuclear weapons by the end of this century a realistic one? Yes, but only, of course, on the condition that there is an honest, mutual desire to do this. Thus G. Smith, former leader of the U.S. delegation to the SALT I talks, stated: "It should not be forgotten that the Soviet proposals come as a 'package' and the United States cannot select from that package only what it likes. The administration is clearly unwilling to agree to a number of the proposals, such as the nuclear test ban." U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger hastened to confirm this. He even "explained": Nuclear explosions are necessary for the modernization of U.S. nuclear arms. In the same way, the Pentagon chief is not about to renounce SDI; although not only the Soviet Union, but the vast majority of Western scientists believe that nuclear arms reduction is possible only if the Soviet Union and the United States both renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms.

There is another side to SDI -- the international-legal and moral side. Space belongs to the whole human race in the dimensions of space and time. This means no one country has the right to take weapons into space without the consent of other countries, like a highwayman on the great Milky Way. Equally, no one administration has the moral right to clutter up distant space with weapons which will hang like the sword of Damocles above the heads of future generations whose voice cannot be heard today.

International observers stress that Moscow is displaying a new approach to the resolution of urgent global problems on a comprehensive basis. While placing the elimination of nuclear weapons in the forefront, at the same time the Soviet Union declares: The transfer of the arms race to space is impermissible; it is necessary this century also to eliminate chemical weapons and to ban the creation of non-nuclear arms based on new physical principles whose destructive capabilities approximate nuclear weapons. Our civilization must reject the philosophy of carnage.

The Soviet plan appeals to mankind's conscience. It proposes DISARMAMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT. That means, instead of guns, butter for the starving; instead of missiles, new forests and clean lakes for the weary.

Only mankind can free itself from the troubles hanging over it. Only people themselves, by comprehending the interrelationship of all peoples and all global problems, can find their own salvation. This faith in human intelligence and solidarity permeates the Soviet Union's entire approach to the resolution of the global problems of today.

People's common responsibility to present and future generations for the fate of the earth REQUIRES A NEW LEVEL OF THOUGHT appropriate to the rapid change in the nature of existence. Mankind's best minds dreamed of this and taught us about it.

"War and hatred add nothing to the joy of rapid joint progress," the French pilot and writer Antoine de Saint-Exupery wrote. "Why hate each other? We are all together, carried on the same planet; we are the crew of one ship. It is good when something new, something better is born in the dispute between different civilizations, but it is monstrous when they devour each other."

Thinking about M.S. Gorbachev's statement, I recall his speech to French parliamentarians on 3 October last year. I know from the reactions that it deeply touched not only the French, but many people throughout the world. The words spoken then displayed a sense of our common involvement in the development of human civilization and our common responsibility for the fate of future generations: "We are all keepers of the flame of life handed on to us by preceding generations.

"Each of them had its mission, and each in its own way enriched world civilization...

"What of our generation? It has made great discoveries, but has also found the formula for the self-annihilation of the human race. On the threshold of the third millennium, we must burn the black book of nuclear 'alchemy.' May the 21st century be the first century of life without the fear of universal destruction.

"We will fulfill this mission if we pool our efforts. The Soviet Union is ready to make its contribution to ensuring a peaceful, free, and prosperous future for Europe and all the other continents."

True to the course proclaimed and deeming it necessary to change the dangerous course of events by force of example and common sense, the Soviet Union went to the Geneva meeting and there sought mutually acceptable accords. That was assessed highly in the world.

Let us not forget the sense of elation and pride in our country and in our leadership which all of us who were in Geneva in those November days felt after the meeting ended. Soon after M.S. Gorbachev's press conference in the Soviet mission, my Paris colleague Vadim Perfilyev and I happened to bump into the correspondent of a major British newspaper in the city center. Anxious to share his impressions at once, he said: "I have just been talking to my father on the telephone. I cannot remember the old man being so excited for a long time. It seems he watched the entire press conference from your mission on television. It is rare for them to show it all, without cuts. And do you know what he said to me? Son, why have you been hiding Gorbachev from us? He talks business and talks in such a way that you believe him!"

More than once after that, I heard all kinds of people, West Europeans and Americans, acknowledge this: They are won over by the Soviet leader's sincere commitment to using every opportunity to prevent what cannot be rectified.

Calling on others to make joint efforts for the sake of peace and security, the Soviet Union demonstrates its will by force of its own example.

People are tired of phrasemongering about peace. They yearn to be able to trust words, words of action. Thinking about the world's reactions to the statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, you feel that for all the different words and intonations, they display a dominant mood: INSPIRATION.

That is the feeling aroused in all kinds of people on our planet by the concrete program proposed by Moscow for the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Let all earthmen greet the new century, the new millenium on a planet cleansed of nuclear pollution, beneath a peaceful sky and space! Is there a nobler, more alluring objective for our generation? Or an objective which places more responsibility on us in relations to our descendants, who must not become nuclear hostages through no fault of their own.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

USSR EXAMINES U.S. REACTIONS TO GORBACHEV INITIATIVE

U.S. 'Hostility' Criticized

PM231420 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Soldatov dispatch: "Different Approaches"]

[Excerpts] New York -- The comprehensive peace program proposed by the Soviet Union has generated clear interest and mixed feelings in the United States. It has become the touchstone for testing people's attitude to the nuclear threat which looms over mankind.

The administration has treated the new Soviet initiative with ill-concealed apprehension. When the first shock caused by the Soviet proposals (the Republican administration clearly did not expect anything like it) was over, Washington was forced to acknowledge that the Soviet initiatives are comprehensive and far-reaching in character.

But administration representatives then immediately began claiming that the Soviet proposals, on the whole, represent the latest ruse and ploy with which the Soviets want to disarm the West, above all the United States, and achieve unilateral advantages. And what the United States would not do under any circumstances was immediately announced. The list formulated by White House press spokesman L. Speakes is noteworthy.

The administration, he stated, is against stopping nuclear explosions because it "regards the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests with suspicion, since the Soviets declared a moratorium in the past and then breached it. We believe we must continue these tests in the interests of our national security." Speakes went on to stress that the United States has no intention of curtailing work in the sphere of the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

Thus, on the one hand, the administration acknowledges the value of the new Soviet proposals and promises to study them carefully. While on the other, it again flatly refuses to join the moratorium on nuclear explosions, which the Soviet Union has extended for a further 3 months, refuses to stop its preparations to implement "star wars," and still charges the Soviet side with "ungentlemanly conduct."

L. Speakes did not act like a gentleman when he stated that the Soviet Union "breached the moratorium on nuclear explosions." The matter was quite different. On 31 March 1958 the Soviet Union declared a unilateral halt to tests of all kinds of atomic and hydrogen weapons. Whereas on 29 December 1959 President D. Eisenhower stated that the

United States did not consider itself bound by the moratorium. In 1960 France carried out nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet Union renewed nuclear tests only in September 1961.

The U.S. intention to continue nuclear tests far from indicates a love of peace on the Republican administration's part. The desire to continue work to create [sozdaniye] space strike weapons does, however, contradict the White House's public statements about a desire to avoid nuclear catastrophe.

The new Soviet proposals have quite a few adversaries here, who are trying to compromise them in every way. Some, for example, state that the Soviet initiatives are unrealistic and a fantasy, since, it is said, it is impossible to destroy or ban what has already been created. They also resort to other not very sophisticated ploys designed to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union and its initiatives. Voices are heard demanding that the Soviet Union "demonstrate its sincerity" and take "concrete steps" to show its "good intentions".

These kinds of demands, which border on interference in the USSR's internal affairs, are dragged out of the archives whenever there is a possibility of reaching an agreement on reducing international tension and improving relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Least of all, however, do they talk in official circles about the real reasons for their hostility to the Soviet peace program. They were revealed, perhaps unwittingly, by a high-ranking Pentagon official in conversation with journalists. He acknowledged that the U.S. leaders "do not know whether they want to find themselves in a world where nuclear weapons do not exist. If they do not want that," he continued, "the NATO countries must stop feigning and pretending that they favor the destruction of nuclear weapons and openly state that their strategy continues to be based on nuclear deterrence."

That is indeed what is at the bottom of it.

U.S. Response Causes 'Mixed Feelings'

PM221010 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Palladin report: "Faced with Choice"]

[Excerpts] Washington -- In an interview which I obtained for IZVESTIYA just before the New Year, well-known science fiction writer Isaac Asimov expressed the hope that mankind would be delivered from nuclear weapons in the 21st century at least. Now the Americans have heard from the mouth of the Soviet leader a gradual, but most important, a realistic plan to achieve this goal by the year 2000.

Washington's first reaction rouses mixed feelings, especially as the White House -- patently not without intent -- is speaking in various voices. For the second day in a row, the President -- carefully choosing his words -- has expressed general satisfaction at the USSR's new manifestation of devotion to the cause of peace and disarmament, although he has permitted himself to interpret Soviet foreign policy extremely freely.

U.S. Secretary of State Shultz is even more restrained in his remarks. What is more, in a speech on ABC television he resorted to hackneyed formulas, describing the new Soviet proposals as "propaganda."

Weinberger took his customary position on the right wing. The Pentagon boss, who on the eve of the Geneva summit meeting warned his President against the slightest show of political realism, this time assumed the role of chief critic of the Soviet initiatives too eagerly. He especially dislikes the idea of abandoning the preparations for "star wars." Many people here believe that it is this approach of Weinberger's that still has the upper hand in the White House. Though, according to R. Reagan, the U.S. Administration intends to carefully study the proposals from Moscow, Washington has already taken decisions on the two most important problems -- if we are to believe local radio and television. The question of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is not even open to discussion, they say. There is no hope either that the United States will finally join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

Ultraconservative U.S. circles, which cannot bear any mention of international detente, continue their attempts to nip in the bud any hope of lessening tension. THE WASHINGTON TIMES, the mouthpiece of the "hawks," is quick to try to predetermine the White House's definitive response, writing that the USSR's new peace initiatives "will scarcely be accepted by the United States ever." As proof it quotes the remarks of a certain Barry (Blechman), who predicts: "There will be no elimination of nuclear weapons, because this is impossible. So we will have to learn to coexist with these weapons."

Broad circles of the public prefer a different kind of coexistence -- peaceful coexistence based on detente and disarmament.

Key Issues Avoided

LD231513 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Jan 86

[From the "Workers Movement" program presented by Bronislav Myakota]

[Excerpt] It is natural that throughout the world people are awaiting Washington's reply to the new Soviet foreign policy actions. For it is precisely the USSR and the United States that should show an example to the other nuclear powers and start the process of nuclear disarmament.

A whole range of questions connected with the complex of Soviet proposals was put to U.S. President Reagan during his conversation with correspondents in the White House. The head of the U.S. Administration replied: We are very grateful for this proposal and we are studying it in great detail. This is virtually the first time that a genuine elimination of nuclear weapons has been proposed.

Undoubtedly the broad scale and multifaceted nature of the Soviet initiatives requires a certain amount of time for analysis in order to elaborate one's detailed attitude to them. Therefore, the statement by a representative of official Washington that the program proposed by the USSR is being studied in detail has considerable importance.

However, one is already being put on guard by the avoidance of the proposal not to permit the creation, testing, and deployment of strike space armaments and on ceasing the testing of nuclear weapons. Neither the head of the White House nor the U.S. state secretary have uttered a single word about these basic questions of the Soviet initiatives.

Politicians Must Take Stand

LD182235 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Jan 86

[Commentary by APN political observer Gennadiy Gerasimov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Hello comrades! The Soviet Union is proposing that mankind should enter the 21st century having left nuclear weapons to the military historians. On learning of this, one politician said: Why wait until the end of the century? Well, probably, if nuclear disarmament is reached earlier, no one will object. But quite a bit depends precisely on this politician, because his name is Ronald Reagan. Reagan also remembered that he had already called for the elimination of nuclear weapons in 1983 when he spoke in the Japanese parliament. Official Washington even claims to have been first to put the proposal, although it is easy to show that our country has been in favor of banning nuclear weapons from the very beginning, when the United States was still feeling dizzy from its nuclear monopoly. And what the U.S. President said in the Japanese parliament was merely in the nature of a good wish. Now Soviet proposals have appeared which, and I quote, differ from everything that we have heard in the past; for the first time someone has proposed the actual elimination of nuclear weapons. And these are Reagan's words again.

Well, I think praise is all well and good, but support for the Soviet proposals is better. I hope that the majority of Americans expect such support from Washington. But there are also in America two detachments of nuclear disarmament opponents behind which the military-industrial complex hides. The first detachment is openly against: take, for example, Zbigniew Brzezinski, who was adviser on national security for President Jimmy Carter. In his opinion it is precisely nuclear weapons which made the world a safer place to live in, because they restrain the aggressor. Without such weapons, he says, the chances of wars breaking out using conventional arms would increase. Here, of course, that part of the Soviet proposals concerning the coordinated reduction of conventional weapons and of armed forces is left out; we are ready to negotiate the reduction of any weapons.

The second detachment of opponents of nuclear disarmament, who are not so open and do not come out with their visors up, have penetrated the highest echelons of power in Washington. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has already stated that the Pentagon will continue to conduct nuclear explosions. They are necessary, to use his expression, for the modernization of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. But there is no sense, and there is no logic either, in occupying oneself with modernization if one sets as one's aim the elimination of nuclear weapons.

It is simpler to eliminate the current, perfect weapons, than tomorrow's, even more perfect, weapons.

The same applies to the "star wars" plans. If the aim of the so-called SDI is the creation of an antimissile defense, then what is the purpose of this defense if missiles are going to be destroyed? There is no reason. A reason appears if other tasks are set: the tasks of creating space strike weapons, including weapons with nuclear components.

The Soviet proposals threaten to expose those politicians who demonstrate the wish, but lack the intention. The moment of truth has come, which forces politicians to define their attitude finally, both to nuclear weapons and to the future of mankind.

Specific Response Urged

LD201855 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 20 Jan 86

[Commentary by Igor Kudrin; from "The World Today" program]

[Excerpts] Hello, comrades. Exactly 5 days ago, on the evening of 15 January, the whole world knew about the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Everyone awaited the reaction from Washington. It came promptly, but it was streamlined, unspecific, and I would say, a sort of wait-and-see [vyzhidatelnyy] reaction. On the day the statement was published President Reagan was introducing a new program titled partnership in the matter of childhood protection. However, the journalists who were present at the official ceremony hurried to ask him questions about the new Soviet initiatives. Reagan was extremely brief and careful in what he said. We are very grateful for this proposal. We are studying it extremely closely. Are you enthusiastic about Gorbachev's statement? The head of the White House replied to this question as follows: Yes, this is virtually the first time the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons has been proposed. We must study the Soviet document closely, analyze and discuss all its details, the White House press spokesman said.

Well, what can you say, this is perfectly natural. Such a document of extreme importance, a document which is serious and profound, demands just such an attitude. Only let the process of deliberation, analysis, and discussion not take too long. Time does not wait, especially as our moratorium extends for another 3 months and as the Soviet Union is proposing that the implementation of the program to free mankind from the fear of a nuclear catastrophe be commenced even this year. Moreover, even now there is alarm at statements being made by people in the President's circle to the effect that the United States will not waive its "star wars" program at any cost, and that nuclear tests in the country will be continued.

The time is ripe to check the deeds of those who love to speak from high platforms about the spirit of Geneva. We shall see whether they refer to the Geneva accord just for effect or whether they are ready to serve detente, mutual understanding, and curbing the arms race in a concrete way.

U.S. 'Paying Lip Service'

LD282142 Moscow TASS in English 2107 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 28 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The LONDON GUARDIAN says today, quoting arms control experts, that it is supposedly the feud between the Pentagon and the U.S. Department of State that is to blame for procrastination with President Reagan's official reply to the Soviet proposals on the elimination of nuclear weapons. As for the President himself, the newspaper quotes its Washington correspondent as saying that he has lately been so immersed in preparations for his State of the Union address that he has found no time to come to grips with the latest Soviet proposals. The U.S. Administration's procrastination tactics, The GUARDIAN thinks, angers critics of the U.S. stand on disarmament problems and, if the situation continues, can cause U.S. allies to voice impatience as well.

So Washington practices procrastination and puts off its reply. What is unclear to the Americans in the Soviet proposals, which suggest a stage-by-stage and consistent process meant completely to rid the world of nuclear weapons over 15 years? The Soviet Union offers a concrete program to clear the way to the folding up of the arms race and to its prevention in outer space, to the overall lessening of the war danger and to the buildup of trust as an essential component of relations among states. Naturally, the appearance of space strike weapons would kill the hope for ridding the world of nuclear weapons. But radical reductions in these weapons can only be possible if the Soviet Union and the United States renounce the development, testing and deployment of space weapons.

The Soviet program envisions at every stage of the deliverance of mankind from nuclear weapons control both by national technical means and through international procedures, including, if need be, on-site inspection. Washington, however, is looking in the Soviet proposals for some "trap," while just seeking a pretext and ways to fragmentize the program and to separate the "star wars" plans from disarmament accords.

U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, for instance, said in an interview to the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT: "We will carry out the President's Strategic Defense Initiative research program, and we won't put limits on it." The point is, however, that U.S. Administration officials are using "research" rhetoric to camouflage their plans to develop space strike weapons and are escalating "star wars" preparations under this cover. In particular, the administration plans to double budget appropriations for SDI already in fiscal 1987. And the Soviet-proposed moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which the USSR extended unilaterally by three months, is rejected by Washington merely to continue working on space-based weapons. It follows from all these actions of the American side that Washington is only paying lip service to the need to stop the arms race, whereas what is needed today is practical actions.

William Colby Cited

OW240735 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Jan 86

[Commentary by Aleksandr Serikov; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The new Soviet peace initiatives continue to evoke a lively response in the world. Here is our commentary:

[Serikov] Hello, comrades I would like to dwell on three points which characterize opinion in the world to the proposals of the Soviet Union. First, it is the respect which the Soviet initiative elicited. There is practically not a single well-known or influential person or organization that would openly, as was the case in the past, reject out of hand the new steps on the road to normalization of the world situation taken by the Soviet State. For example, William Colby, former director of the CIA, who highly assessed the Soviet peace initiatives, called on the U.S. Administration to join the moratorium on nuclear tests and to repudiate the SDI project.

think that a reaction of this type is conditionalin the first place on the validity of the Soviet proposals. Thanks to the meeting in Geneva, the world community was able to widely familiarize itself with the constructive position of the Soviet Union on a series of international questiong and to react to it with understanding and sympathy. The reason for this understanind and sympathy can be found in the logical and well-reasoned Soviet positions.

One more point which is a positive result of our initiatives is the force that they give to the movements of fighters against nuclear weapons and for ending the arms race in various countries. For example, Pat Harman, one of the organizers of the U.S. Campaign for the Freeze of Nuclear Weapons organization, stated that the discontinuation of nuclear tests would be the first step in the reduction of nuclear weapons. We are struggling for the United States to join the moratorium, she said, and the movement of peace-loving forces in our country has been very much inspired by the new Soviet initiatives.

Reagan Avoids 'Key Question'

LD251151 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 25 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 25 TASS -- "The latest Soviet proposals have been welcomed with ethusiastic approval and support by the world public as a whole and by the governments and statesmen of many countries," Anatoliy Leontiyev says in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. "The press stresses in reactions and comments that these proposals are concrete, realistic and constructive and that they meet the vital interests of all the countries and peoples.

"As for the U.S. Administration, newspapers initially reported that the Soviet proposals caught it by surprise. The U.S. President, choosing his words carefully, expressed general satisfaction with another manifestation of the Soviet Union's commitment to the cause of peace and disarmament and promised to give careful consideration to Moscow's proposals. He said he hoped that at some time in the future (sic) an end will be put completely to nuclear weapons. What is important, however, is not what the president said but what he did not say. He avoided answering the key question: Does the USA agree to renounce its 'star wars' program, the main obstacle to ending an arms race on earth?"

"Neither did he say if the USA was at long last ready to join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which had been extended by another three months, to March 31.

"American corporations reaped 203 billion dollars in profit (before taxes) in 1983. The figure in 1984 was 246 billion dollars and further climbed in 1985. Peace is a threat to these profits. That is why some figures in the USA still nurture the crazy idea that there are more important things than peace.

"We are against space weapons, against the mentality of a caveman, who only thought of finding as strong a club or as heavy a stone as possible. We are aware in full measure of our responsibility before the present and succeeding generations. It is our profound conviction that we should take into the third millennium not the 'star wars' program but large-scale projects for the peaceful exploration of space jointly by all the peoples."

U.S. Actions Counter Proposal

PM271336 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Jan 86 First Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Responsibility to the Peoples"]

[Text] It is 10 days since the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was made public. And the more we read its text, ponder its contents, and familiarize ourselves with the avalanche of comments on this document, the

more clearly the truly historic, landmark significance of the comprehensive peace program set forth in it appears before us. At the complex and dangerous juncture to which the forces of militarism and aggression have now led the development of events in the international arena and under conditions when mankind is most acutely faced with the question "to be or not to be?", Moscow proposes to all the world's peoples the path to the future. To a future worthy of our civilization.

The large-scale package of Soviet peace initiatives and the major foreign policy actions of a fundamental nature on which the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the Soviet Government adopted a decision at the beginning of the year are already known everywhere. The linchpin is the 15-year program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world. This is a problem of significance to all mankind. To solve it is to deliver the human race from destruction in the flames of a nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet initiative is not just an appeal, not just a delcaration. It indicates clearly delineated routes and guidelines and incorporates three organically linked stages which proceed one from the other and, in a number of their elements, penetrate each other, as it were. Specific times for realizing them have been defined, and ways have been outlined to reach mutually acceptable and strictly verifiable accords. It is perfectly obvious that no one will lose as a result of implementing the total elimination of nuclear weapons proposed by the Soviet Union. Everyone will gain by it.

To free our planet from the threat of nuclear destruction and to complete this process before the end of the present century, to enter the third emillennium without nuclear weapons -- this is the aim the Soviet Union sets before all the world's peoples. It goes without saying, however, that this aim can only be achieved given the mutual renunciation by the Soviet Union and the United States of the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. Peaceful space, not "star wars" -- this is the only real way to make nulcear weapons superfluous and reduce them to naught. In short, a ban on the deployment of strike arms in space is the only natural precondition for the liquidation of nuclear weapons.

Although the elimination of nuclear weapons constitutes the very essence of the comprehensive peace program advanced by the Soviet Union, it is nonetheless comprehensive because it also provides for other measures which, in themselves, are of major, fundamental significance. These include the closing of all channels for improving nuclear weapons through the total cessation of their testing, following the USSR's example; the removal of chemical weapons from states' arsenals; a ban on the creation of non-nuclear arms which approximate in terms of casualty effect to means of mass destruction; the activation of the entire existing system of talks in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm; measures to strengthen security in Asia; and an approach to resolving global problems which are being exacerbated all the time. This is why all mankind is showing such close interest in the Soviet program and this is why all sober-minded people so widely hail and approve it.

The Soviet Union has addressed to all peoples and states an ardent appeal to ensure a better world.

But this appeal is addressed primarily to the United States. Indeed, precisely the Soviet Union and the United States are the economically most powerful states in the world with the greatest military potential -- above all, nuclear missile potential -- and with the greatest political weight in the international area. Consequently, they bear special responsibility for the nature of world development, for its course and consequences. "The acuteness of the present moment," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, "leaves the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States and the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States no alternative but to grasp the great science of living together."

What has been Washington's reaction to the new Soviet initiatives? As distinct from the past, this time it has not rejected Moscow's proposals outright or hastily branded them with the stereotyped lable "propaganda." On the contrary, both the President and other official spokesmen of the U.S. Administration have been unable to deny the constructive nature of the Soviet program.

But, in speaking of the reaction on the other side of the ocean to the comprehensive peace program advanced by the Soviet Union, it would be wrong to maintain that it has been greeted there with open arms, as the saying goes. It is perfectly obvious that, forced to reckon with public opinion, the White House is resorting to a two-faced policy and is maneuvering. On the one hand, it proclams that the Soviet proposals "merit serious study," while on the other it continues to reject the appeal to subscribe to the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on all nuclear explosions and continues to step up preparations for "star wars."

Obviously inspired articles which, to put it mildly, cast doubt on the possibility of realizing the Soviet proposals in practice have begun appearing increasingly frequently in the U.S. mass media. It is possible to cite as an example an article by WASHINGTON POST commentator P. Geyelin. He claims that you cannot "pretend that the world can ever be totally rid of the threat of nuclear arms," and he denies the existence of any alternative to "the nuclear potential of deterrence." "The unavoidable truth is that there is no alternative," the commentator concludes his article.

It is not a question here of the stand taken by certain journalists. And not even just of the stand taken by particular U.S. politicians, whether Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, White House Press Secretary L. Speakes, or P. Buchanan, one of the President's leading advisers, who even in Washington has a reputation as being extremely right-wing and who continues even now to campaign for confrontation with the Soviet Union, declaring that the United States "is in a state of conflict with the Soviet Union all over the world." It goes without saying that such statements can in no way help to improve relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and do not tally with the "Geneva spirit." But we repeat, it is not just a question of them; the thing is the thing itself -- reader, please forgive the pun -- or, rather, real things.

These things are as follows. Official Washington, goaded on by the military-industrial complex, is still a prisoner of the elemental forces of the arms race which it unleashed and of the preparations for "star wars." Nuclear test explosions are continuing unabated on the Nevada range. Work on the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapons is being expanded. According to data in DEFENSE NEWS, the Lockheed missiles and space company has just received a contract to develop [razrabotka] an interceptor missile which is worth $350 million. Big orders from the Pentagon have also gone to other corporations involved in realizing the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" -- TRW, McDonnell Douglas, and others.

To rephrase the well-known expression, you might say that the Pentagon and those who are behind it are guided by the principle "spare no expense for catridges." And what cartridges -- nuclear ones! And what expense -- trillions!

According to the U.S. Defense Department's "Directives in the Defense Sphere for Fiscal 1985-1989," it is planned to spend $1,958.6 billion on building up U.S. military strength over the next 5 years, that is, very nearly $2 trillion!

One constantly encounters reports in the press of new strategic concepts and cannibalistic "scenarios" being drawn up by U.S. military-political snalysts. There is the new exposition of "naval strategy" prepared by Admiral J. Watkins, chief of U.S. naval operations. And there is the futurological study by one C. (Grey), who openly discussed what even the most inveterate militarists in the United States prefer to keep in profound secrecy. Here is a sample of the demands formulated and "substantiated" by (Grey). In his opinion, the U.S. tasks in 1995-2005 will consist of: first, "destroying Soviet nuclear forces"; second, "dominating in escalation"; and, third, acquiring the potential to "defend the homeland and to mobilize for victory under the conditions of this homeland sheltered behind walls." How can such a "scenario" be reconciled with the accord reached by the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva that nuclear war must never be unleashed and can have no winners?

And yet such totally wild ravings -- from the viewpoint of a sober-minded person -- are made the basis of planning for a further buildup of the might of the U.S. Armed Forces and for strengthening the U.S. military potential. It is not for nothing that the Pentagon envisages equipping the armed forces by the year 2000 with an additional 600 types of weapons and combat hardware created on the basis of the latest scientific achievements and increasing by more than 50 percent the number of army divisions and air force fighter units. What can one say about all these facts? The attempts by the U.S. military-political leadership to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union are illusory and impracticable. They have never led to success in the past, and will do so still less in the future. But they could inflame the situation still more and make the threat of world catastrophe still more palpable. Those who take this path do not want to be conscious of the measure of responsibility which history has placed on the Soviet Union and the United States, responsibility to mankind and for the future of mankind.

What is needed in our time is bold new approaches, new political thinking, and heightened awareness of one's responsibility for the people's destinies. All these qualities are possessed in full measure by the comprehensive peace program set forth in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement of 15 January 1986. It is designed to ensure that mankind greets the year 2000 beneath peaceful skies and space, does not know fear of a nuclear, chemical, or any other threat of destruction, and is firmly confident of its own survival and of the continuation of the human race. Today the practical actions of leading politicians and of governments, above all, should be measured with the yardstick of responsibility. As is known, the Soviet Union has never held matters up. Is the United States conscious of its responsibility to the peoples?

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

USSR CONTINUES TO AWAIT U.S. RESPONSE TO PEACE OFFER

'Cannot Be Brushed Aside'

LD232328 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 23 Jan 86]

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Millions of people throughout the world, including the United States, are awaiting a specific and well-grounded reply from Washington to the Soviet peace initiatives set forth in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. This historic program, corresponding to the interests of all mankind, cannot be brushed aside with a polite statement that the Soviet proposals merit serious study. Figures of state and ordinary people in many countries want to know whether the White House is prepared to meet the realistic Soviet disarmament program half-way.

The USSR's proposals are dictated by political wisdom. This is the opinion of William Fulbright, former chairman of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress. It is essential to strive for the implementation of these promising initiatives, for which one should strengthen trust between our countries and first and foremost radically change idea about the Soviet Union, which is in many respects incorrect.

Here is the view of George McGovern, former Democratic senator, who called the Soviet program very constructive: I hope very much, he said, that the U.S. Administration will make use of this real opportunity to halt the arms race and will not undertake steps that would complicate the advance toward the liquidation of nuclear weapons. The USSR, stressed McGovern, has made a significant step forward and the United States should give an appropriate answer to this.

Side by side with such a realistic approach to the Soviet proposals, a different, militaristic tendency exists, or rather, prevails as before, in Washington's corridors of power. Under pressure from public opinion, the adherents of this tendency pretend that they too favor constructive negotiations with Moscow. This shows with particular clarity, as foreign observers note, in the White House's maneuvers. On the one hand it declares that the Soviet initiatives merit serious study, while on the other it continues to reject the call to join in the moratorium on all nuclear tests, announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union, and continues to press ahead with its "star wars" program, aimed at the militarization of space.

Time will tell whether the White House's position will undergo any change.

From the most varied capitals responses to the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev continue to flow in. They show that the Soviet initiatives have become a powerfully influential factor upon policy and public opinion throughout the world.

'Constructive' Response Urged

PM271400 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Article by Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences United States and Canada Institute, under the rubric "Entering the 21st Century Without Weapons": "Justifying the Planet's Hopes"]

[Excerpt] The Soviet-U.S. summit last November raised hopes that the international situation will be improved and universal security strengthened. However, for this to happen the Geneva process must be further developed. The Soviet Union, honestly implementing the Geneva accords, has proposed a phased, consistent, and complete elimination of nuclear arsenals, reducing the stockpiles of lethal arms to zero.

The first stage provides for a 50-percent reduction by the Soviet Union and the United States, with in 5-8 years, of nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. They are to retain no more than 6,000 charges each on the remaining delivery vehicles. Understandably, such a drastic reduction is possible only if both the Soviet Union and the United States refrain from the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms. The creation of such weapons, as the Soviet Union has warned on more than one occasion, will shatter the hopes for a reduction of nuclear arms on earth. Consequently, a constructive approach by the U.S. side, above all on the space issue, is indispensable. Space must remain peaceful; strike weapons must not be deployed there. Preventing the arms race from spreading into near-earth space means paving the way to deep cuts in nuclear arms.

The first stage also envisages the elimination of medium-range Soviet and U.S. missiles, both ballistic and cruise missiles, in Europe. This would represent the first step toward ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union and the United States would have to pledge that they would not supply strategic or medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France would have to promise that they would not build up their corresponding nuclear arms.

The second stage would begin no later than 1990 and last 5-7 years. At this stage the remaining nuclear powers would join in nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union and the United States would continue with the reductions agreed on during the first stage. They would also implement further measures to eliminate their medium-range nuclear arms and freeze their tactical nuclear means. When the 50-percent reduction of corresponding arms is accomplished by the Soviet Union and the United States, another radical step would be taken, namely the elimination by all nuclear powers of their tactical nuclear weapons. During the same period the Soviet-U.S. accord on banning space strike arms would become multilateral, entailing the obligatory participation of all leading industrial powers. In addition, all nuclear powers would have to end nuclear weapons tests.

The third stage would begin no later than 1995. The elimination of nuclear arms would be completed. By the end of 1999 there would be no nuclear weapons left on earth. A universal accord would be elaborated pledging never again to produce such weapons. Herein lies the tremendous historic significance of the Soviet initiative and its unique, practical thrust.

The Soviet proposals are far-reaching, topical, and specific. We regard reliable verification as a most important and indispensable element in the implementation of the

measures to eliminate nuclear and other types of weapons. Wherever verification by means of national technical facilities does not produce sufficient confidence, comprehensive use can be made of on-site inspections and other forms of international verification.

Another circumstance must be specially mentioned. As distinct from the U.S. "star wars" plan which hinges on the creation [sozdaniye] of new space strike weapons utilizing nuclear energy, our program is truly a program to remove the nuclear danger. An important precondition for its implementation is rising above national egoism, tactical calculations, disputes, and discord. Their significance is negligible compared with the preservation of mankind's main asset, namely peace and a secure future.

The entire content of the [Gorbachev] statement is concrete new evidence of the peace-loving foreign policy of our party and state. It is the practical implementation of the line of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and of the principled provisions of the draft new edition of the CPSU Program, the course of struggle for peace and social progress.

The time has come to definitively and irreversibly put an end to the senseless nuclear arms race. "Nuclear explosions must stop disfiguring the face of our common refuge, the planet earth," the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal to the U.S. Congress says. "The nuclear threat must be eliminated once and for all." The dialogue which was initiated at summit level has shown that it is possible to achieve accords provided that both sides display readiness to act in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted in Geneva. The Soviet Union has shown its readiness to act in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted in Geneva. The Soviet Union has shown its readiness by putting forward a concrete disarmament program. We are waiting for Washington's constructive response.

PRAVDA Editorial Article

PM291635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "A Necessary Prerequisite"]

[Text] The world continues to actively discuss the large-scale new Soviet peace initiative put forward in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The new Soviet proposals have touched the peoples' innermost feelings. Millions of people are asking: Could anything be more encouraging and inspiring than the real prospect of approaching the year 2000 without nuclear weapons?

A characteristic feature of the Soviet program for a nuclear-free world is its concrete and realistic nature. It does not only present for discussion by governments and peoples proposals elaborated in detail, divided into stages with set time frames, for ridding the planet of nuclear weapons. At the same time, it names the obstacles which could stand in the way of the resolution of this extremely urgent task. Chief among these obstacles is the Washington administration's intention to deploy space strike arms in near-earth space.

Mankind must see the two fundamentally different approaches to the question of the use of outer space clearly.

The Soviet Union, aware of its responsibility in the matter of preserving and strengthening peace, has, from the very start of the nuclear and space age, come out insistently against the use of space for military purposes, proposing concrete plans for the development of broad international cooperation in the study and utilization of extra-terrestrial space for the benefit of all the peoples. This stance is an integral part of the unchanging foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet State, which is characterized by the desire to focus attention on the constructive avenues which lead to averting the danger of war.

The Soviet Union calls on all states -- first and foremost, the United States -- to look at the situation prevailing in the world soberly and objectively. It is a reality of our time that, given the level achieved in the development of science and technology, the spread of the arms race to space carries the threat of the emergence of an extremely dangerous situation: the destabilization of the military-political situation and the stepping up of a race which will inevitably get out of control and put mankind in the path of irreversible processes. Hence, our efforts to prevent space from being turned into a potential theater of military operations.

"The USSR," M.S. Gorbachev stated, "regards the prevention of the spread of the arms race to space as a fundamental condition for the preservation of mankind."

Counterposed to this humane course is the fundamentally different U.S. course, which is dictated by the desire to turn space into a military bridgehead from which it would be possible to win domination on earth and dictate their own will to mankind by using space strike weapons.

Assurances that the "star wars" program -- in the propagandist guise of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" -- is supposedly only in the nature of harmless research cannot conceal its militarist essence, which is profoundly hostile to mankind's peace-loving aspirations. Under cover of these demagogic arguments, in reality an extensive process is taking place of creating [sozdaniye] space weapon systems which are by no means designed for defense. The point is that it is impossible to create a universal space defense; this is at best an illusion -- from the technical, economic, and political viewpoints.

But any "space shield" can very easily be turned into a "space sword." He who holds it in his hands might not resist the temptation to use it. That is the crux of the matter and the source of the Soviet position, which is dictated exclusively by the interest of preserving peace.

The "star wars" program incorporates the claims of earlier years to the attainment of U.S. military superiority. Militarist circles are unwilling to reconcile themselves to the ideas of military-strategic parity, which socialism has achieved. They still entertain the illusion that this parity is a temporary phenomenon and that by implementing the "star wars" program they will be able to return to lost times. The desire to use space to achieve decisive military superiority and create the potential for a first nuclear strike with impunity -- that is the true purpose of the notorious SDI.

It is a direct and dangerous encroachment on the cause of world peace. One condition of the maintenance of peace in the nuclear age is the maintenance of strategic stability. The Soviet Union and the other peace-loving states are advocating observance of the principle of equality and identical security, persistently seeking a lower level of

armaments. The "star wars" program is dangerous because its implementation would result in the disappearance of the very foundation of strategic stability. It is naive to seek a solution to the security problem by refining the shield and the sword. Today there can be no U.S. security without Soviet security or security for the NATO countries without security for the Warsaw Pact states; without this there can be no general security.

Peaceful coexistence, relaxation of tension, lowering of the level of military confrontation, and strengthening of trust between countries -- this is the highway to peace in our time. But will it be possible to talk about trust between countries and tranquility for mankind when, with the development [sozdaniye] of space weapon systems, important decisions, irreversible in terms of their consequences, are being made by machines, not by people?

The U.S. Administration's obstinate desire to implement the "star wars" program at all costs has become the chief obstacle on the path to the attainment of a goal which all mankind wants -- the elimination of nuclear weapons. Claims that the implementation of SDI could lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons fool no one. Space strike weapons are being planned and developed [sozdavat] in addition to, rather than instead of the U.S. offensive nuclear potential.

Washington makes no secret of the fact that the paramount reason for the U.S. refusal to accept the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on nuclear weapon tests is that the tests are essential to the development [razrabotka] of a type of space strike weapon -- the X-ray laser which is triggered by a nuclear explosion. That is why certain U.S. circles would like to torpedo the 1972 Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty which is an inhibiting factor in the unbridled nuclear arms race.

The announcement of the "star wars" program set alarm bells ringing all over the world. All peace-loving forces, including those in the United States, rose to combat the danger. Justice is certainly on the side of the sensible people in that country who say the question today is: either "star wars" or "star peace," either peaceful coexistence or the threat of total nonexistence. The wishes of states and peoples were graphically reflected by the recent vote at the UN General Assembly 40th session when essentially all members of the international community -- 151 states -- supported a resolution urging prevention of an arms race in space. The United States refused to vote for the resolution.

The U.S. Administration has said more than once that it is dedicated to the aim of completely eliminating nuclear weapons everywhere.

Washington has now been given a practical opportunity to do this. It is clear to any reasonable person that instead of wasting the next 10-15 years on developing [sozdaniya] new, extremely dangerous weapons in space, weapons that are extremely costly for mankind, weapons allegedly designed to make nuclear armaments unnecessary, it is far wiser to set about destroying these armaments and ultimately, reducing them to zero.

Our country has laid on the table at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms a proposal to halve Soviet and U.S. nuclear arms capable of reaching one another's territory. Adoption of such a proposal would be an important step toward completely eliminating nuclear weapons. Anyone who tries to padlock the solution of the problem of the nonmilitarization of space demonstrates by doing so that he does not want to halt the arms race on earth either. There is nothing fortuitous in the fact that the advocates of the

nuclear arms race and the U.S. military-industrial complex bigwigs are ardent adherents of the "star wars" program. They are two aspects of the same flawed policy, which is incompatible with the desire of millions of people for a durable peace.

The Soviet Union's proposal for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons conceals no tactical calculations and is free of national egotism. The preservation of peace on earth matters to us above all else. As soon as nuclear weapons appeared in states' arsenals, it was precisely the Soviet Union that proposed banning them forever. The energy of the atom should serve peace only, the good of mankind exclusively -- that has been the invariable position of the CPSU and the Soviet State.

The Soviet Union has proposed, the countries and peoples ensuring that the planet enters the third millennium not with a platform of "star wars," but with plans for the peaceful conquest of space by the efforts of all mankind. The program which it has submitted for destroying nuclear weapons is realistic and feasible. But, we repeat once again, the "star wars" concept is a most serious obstacle here. The Soviet Union has repeatedly warned that the creation [sozdaniya] of strike space weapons will cancel out [perecherknet] hopes of reducing nuclear arms on earth. We cannot allow the concupiscence of a handful of U.S. military-industrial complex bosses and their placemen to prevail over the vital interests of mankind.

Of course, if the United States nevertheless embarks on the path of creating [sozdaniye] space weapons, we will have to make an appropriate effective response. The Soviet Union has no fear of lagging behind in a space race if one is imposed on us. But that is not our choice; we do not want it.

Space should be peaceful. Its gates should be shut tight against weaponry. There should be no place there for space strike arms; indeed, they should not be created [sozdavatsya] at all. Peace can be preserved on earth and the sky above must remain clear. That is the imperious command of the times. That is the burden of historical responsibility which lies with the decisions and actions of states and governments in the period remaining until the start of the third millennium.

It is no longer enough to want to prevent nuclear war or just to understand where the threat of it stems from. To end the arms race once and for all and to turn the course of international events onto the rails of peaceful development, it is necessary for everyone -- governments, political parties, and peoples -- to act and to act quickly.

World Awaits Response

LD311056 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 31 Jan 86

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Gerasichev from New York]

[Excerpt] The U.S. side has not yet replied to the complex of Soviet foreign policy initiatives directed at eliminating all nuclear weapons, preventing the militarization of space, and eliminating all other means of mass destruction. Our correspondent Vladimir Gerasichev reports from New York:

Americans today, just like all peoples in the world, are waiting for a response from the administration which in principle has welcomed them [USSR initiatives] and promised to study them carefully with its allies. This was the first reaction from the White

House to the new Soviet peace initiatives, which, to judge by what is being said in the local press, have taken Washington unawares.

There then followed attempts -- now sadly a tradition on the U.S. side -- to diminish the significance of the Soviet program, for the elimination of nuclear weapons and to bypass the basic tenets of our proposals, that is, not to permit the creation [Sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike weapons, and to stop testing nuclear weapons. Finally, statements came saying that President Reagan is still bound by his decision to support the "star wars" program.

This was followed by a silence which could better be described as a clamming up. This, however, was resolutely opposed by the U.S. public by numerous antiwar and trade union organizations who want to end the arms race and transform the atmosphere of the summit meeting in Geneva into tangible results in the area of disarmament and arms control.

'Took Washington by Surprise'

PM271716 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent G. Vasilyev: "What Will America's Response Be?"]

[Text] New York, January -- Let us return to the first U.S. reaction to the new Soviet initiatives. It was almost unanimously positive. President Reagan said he was "very grateful for the proposal" and that the U.S. leadership was "studying it carefully." Secretary of State Shultz also gave, by and large, a positive assessment of the Soviet peace initiative. Although he did complain about the Soviet Union making it public, as if informing the world public could hinder progress toward reaching an accord between Washington and Moscow on the main disarmament problems. Only one representative of the Washington "big three," Defense Secretary Weinberger, tried to put an immediate damper on people's hopes of success. Work in the United States on the "Strategic Defense Initiative," that is, preparations for the deployment of space strike weapons, he said, will continue no matter what.

A CBS correspondent noted in a report from Moscow: "The new proposals put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev and his emphasis on improving Soviet-U.S. relations are an important part of the program the CPSU is taking to its congress." There were plenty of positive words in the U.S. press. It called the new Soviet proposals "breathtaking," "far-reaching," "detailed." The papers acknowledged that the Soviet proposals contain elements of compromise and take into account the positions of the United States and other countries, that they have given rise to a wave of hope throughout the world and the Reagan administration will find it hard to resist public pressure in its own country and in Western Europe if it does not respond to the Soviet Union with something constructive.

It was also placed on record that the USSR's new, far-reaching peace initiatives, according to the U.S. press, took official Washington by surprise.

But only a few days had passed when, as if some invisible conductor had waved his baton, the U.S. press and television began to wind up the discussion. Explaining the sudden "decline in interest" in the Soviet proposals, NEWSWEEK magazine writes that the administration's desire to "lower expectations" is begind it. Why should it need to do this? The popular weekly does not answer this question. But the answer is clear: The Soviet proposals have everywhere galvanized public movements advocating curbing

the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and relaxing international tension. Pressure by these movements is becoming a real force which the politicians at the helm of government in the United States and in other Western countries cannot ignore.

As TIME magazine writes, deep in the U.S. Administration discussion has begun on the question of how to respond to the Soviet peace initiatives. "Obviously, the debate is going to be fierce," the magazine writes. "A deep split has long been apparent in the administration's ranks on arms control questions. And past U.S. proposals have come about only after prolonged and at times, heated exchanges."

What is stopping Washington from responding immediately and constructively to Moscow's peace initiatives with its own?

The other day Americans who know their history celebrated a significant date. On 17 January it was 25 years since President Eisenhower's farewell speech on leaving the White House, in which, for the first time, he used the term "military-industrial complex."

This man, who devoted nearly all his life to the army and therefore knew what he was talking about, said that there had occurred in the United States an amalgamation between the colossal military machine and the vast military industry whose "total influence -- political, economic, and even spiritual -- is felt in every city, in every state, and in every federal institution."

The jubilee did not pass unnoticed, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote that in 25 years the alliance of the Pentagonites, arms manufacturers, the scientists and engineers who are nourished by them, and reactionary members of Congress has become even wider and all-pervasive. The paper gave the following figures: One in twenty jobs in the United States is associated directly or indirectly with appropriations under the "defense expenditure" heading. Some 25 percent of all U.S. scientists and engineers serve the god of war. The Pentagon plans to spend more than $300 billion, $34 billion of it on scientific research and design work. The paper quoted Jerome Wiesner, former special science and technology assistant under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson: "It is no longer a question of how to control the military-industrial complex, but how to prevent the United States from turning into a total military society."

The voice of this "unholy alliance," held together by the pursuit of profit and by its belligerent chauvinism, can be heard in the speeches of Caspar Weinberger, a loyal advocate of California's aerospace corporations. Of course, the Soviet peace program rankles generals and admirals trying to progress in the service, weapons manufacturers making their fortunes from fulfilling "defense programs," politicians on their anti-communist hobbyhorse, and all kinds of "Sovietologists" sowing seeds of hatred toward people who have chosen the path of socialism. The implementation of the program threatens them with considerable reductions in the income and privileges they have had recently. But it is not only the military-industrial complex as such which stands in the way of the implementation of the prospects opened up by Geneva for an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, an improvement in the international situation, and the quest for accords on limiting the arms race on earth and preventing one in space. The anticommunist confrontational habits and stereotypes of the U.S. Administration also work against it.

Let us not forget that 5 years ago the Reagan administration came to power under the slogan of a "new American Revolution" which on closer examination turned out to be a direct reflection of the most reactionary U.S. circles' assertive desire to turn the

development of world history back to a favorable direction for U.S. imperialism. Right-wing Republicans proclaimed the achievement of military superiority as the lever for this. The rapid buildup of the Pentagon budget began and more and more military programs went into production. Attempts to pressure the socialist countries and to carry out interventionist interference in the affairs of "third World" peoples became the dominant features of Washington foreign policy. The heavy locomotive of the belligerent policy of confrontation gathered speed and momentum and it was not easy to slow it down. Particularly since Washington was in no hurry to do so.

Life, however, showed not only the danger, but the groundlessness of the main postulates of the U.S. Administration's foreign policy. First and foremost, Washington's calculations that by expediting U.S. military preparations, it would be possible to wreck military-strategic parity and tip the balance of forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries in its favor failed to materialize. "Despite the $2 trillion rearmament spree undertaken by the U.S. Administration," THE WASHINGTON POST notes in this connection, today the U.S. military machine does not have any marked superiority over the Soviet Armed Forces. Nor did the hopes that by imposing an arms race on us, the United States would be able to exhaust and undermine the socialist countries' economies come to fruition.

Not all Americans have immediately recognized the lessons of the past few years.

Yet, in the United States there is a gradually growing distrust in the recipes proposed by the Republican administration for "strong-arm" and "surgical" solutions to world problems. Fears are mounting here over the possibly catastrophic consequences of the policy of confrontation, which Washington cannot or will not abandon.

Now that the process of the normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations under the influence of Geneva has been somewhat stepped up [neskolko aktivizirovalsya] and the White House, in its own words, is "studying in detail" the range of Soviet peace proposals that demand a really businesslike response, many people in the United States are asking the question: What can we expect from U.S. leaders? Are they prepared to go further than changing the tone of their speeches and agreeing to seek compromises?

Specific answers to these questions will be given by Washington's practical actions. But, without waiting for this, another United States will have its say. The answer will be given in its citizens' homes, on city streets and squares where peace compaigners demonstrate, and under the vaults of the Capitol where discussions rage between sober-minded legislators and "hawks." In other words, it will depend to a considerable extent on the correlation of forces in the United States itself and in the world and on the degree of activeness of social movements.

The wide-ranging complex of peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union is having a powerful influence on the international political climate. As the U.S. Peace Council statement says, "The phased plan proposed by the Soviet Union for ridding the world of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 along with the Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions are not only inspiring news for all those who struggle for peace, but a remarkable opportunity which must be grasped by all peace-loving forces."

U.S. Resorts to Delaying Tactics

LD011822 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Feb 86

[Soviet television political observer Valentin Zorin commentary; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Much may be said about the various nuances in Washington's reaction to the Soviet initiatives, but the main thing, the crux of the matter, lies in the fact that there has not yet been a genuine, formal reaction or any specific response to the absolutely specific proposals set forth in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. And this is so despite the fact that we are already in the 3d week since these truly historic proposals were promulgated.

As is known, the White House's very first reaction was positive. The importance and the constructive, even innovatory nature of Comrade Gorbachev's statement was noted. True, this was done only in a very general sense, without anything really specific being said. But the very fact that this time in Washington they had departed from the practice of unpleasant memory of rejecting Soviet proposals outright without bothering to read or study them was assessed as a positive factor.

But there then followed a series of very confusing and contradictory statements by various high-ranking figures in the Washington administration, which basically amounted to belittling and distorting the Soviet proposals, which meant creating a propaganda smokescreen around them and reducing the great impression that they had made on the world, as well as on the U.S. public.

However, no official or -- and this is the main thing -- substantial reply has been given, and still has not been given to this day.

It stands to reason that the whole complex of the Soviet proposals -- whose crux is the specific program for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons throughout the world over the next 15 years and the prevention of the militarization of outer space, a program which is calculated for a precise and definite period of time -- requires attentive and businesslike examination.

But close study is one thing and obvious dragging out of time is something else. The Washington administration has a sufficient number of qualified specialists who do not need whole weeks to work out the essence of the Soviet proposals. In connection with this some observers are saying that the opponents of a Soviet-U.S. accord, having not dared to give a blunt no to the steps proposed by the Soviet Union in the face of world public opinion, have decided to resort to delaying tactics and a reluctance to give direct answers. The poignancy of the impression made by the Soviet initiatives will, they are saying, become dulled with time and the whole thing will probably grind to a halt. Well, if that sort of thinking really does exitst, then it is naive, to say the least. Mikhail Seregeyevich's statement raises such problems of world importance and opens up such prospects for resolving them that life itself will not permit the avoidance of a reply to them.

The whole world expects from Washington not petty cunning nor political maneuvering, but a constructive response corresponding to the scope and the level of the problems that are being faced.

'Practical Deeds' Awaited

LD051507 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 5 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Three weeks have passed since the Soviet Union put forward its large-scale program with a well-thought-out schedule for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons with a ban on space strike systems. As they continue extensively to discuss and comment on these initiatives, notable politicians and public figures and the mass media in different countries stress over and over again that the Soviet proposals constitute a milestone in the Soviet Union's struggle for strengthening and safeguarding peace and for enabling mankind to enter the third millennium without nuclear weapons.

The world is welcoming the Soviet peace offensive -- but it obviously is not to the liking of those forces in the West, first and foremost in the USA, which link their policy not to prospects for the revival and extension of detente but to plans for the further intensive material preparations for war. Naturally, today, when international relations are coloured with "the spirit of Geneva" and when millions of people are protesting ever stronger against the chaos of the nuclear arms race, even many proponents of the imperialist policy "from strength" do not dare openly call for the escalation of the arms race. But nowadays the peoples judge policies pursued by states and governments not by their words but by their real readiness for a new approach and for a fresh look at events and processes on the international scene. However, Washington's foreign policy causes puzzlement and even wariness.

The implementation of the program of ridding the world of nuclear weapons is possible only if the United States renounces its plans to militarize space. But what is the answer of Washington policy makers to Moscow's appeal for the cancellation of the militarist plans of "star wars" preparations? Some time ago U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger publicly stated that he was very worried by the Soviet Union's continued linkage of its proposals on arms cuts to Washington's renunciation of SDI. The U.S. President has now said in his State of the Union address to Congress that the United States remains fully committed to its space program, allegedly a "security shield" intended to make nuclear weapons obsolete.

These are old and absolutely fallacious arguments! Many authoritative politicians, experts and military specialists both in the USSR and in the West, including the USA, stress with concrete facts and calculations that the purpose and meaning of the "star wars" program is to use the latest achievements of science and technology and to extend the arms race into space in order to secure military-strategic superiority and to gain a capability to deliver the first strike while repulsing or minimizing retaliation. In other words, SDI means not defense but offense and the escalation of nuclear arms arsenals. Obviously, the other side would have in these circumstances to take adequate measures to ensure its security, which is bound to initiate another round of the arms race of an unprecedented scope and with unpredictable consequences.

There has never been in the history of warfare such a dangerous plan as Washington's "star wars" program, which is pushing the world to a point of no return!

This is becoming more and more clear to many people in the United States itself. And if there is any "commitment" to the "star wars" program in America, it is not the

American people, who like the Soviet people want peace and dependable security, nor realistic American politicians who are committed to that militarist program but first and foremost those forces in the USA which stand for the interests and ambitions of the powerful military-industrial complex, the Californian and other "arms kings" earning nine-digit profits from the production of new and "supernew" weapons.

In the past five years the aggregate profits of the 10 leading U.S. military-industrial corporations alone have grown by 150 percent while the plans to militarize space promise those war merchants even fatter profits.

There are many people in the Pentagon, in the military industrial complex and in the administration who have to choose between peace, on the one hand, and profit, on the other, Gus Hall, the leader of the American Communists, justly points out. And they will continue to give preference to profit even if this means the transfer of the arms race into outer peace and the escalation of the threat of nuclear annihilation.

Time and developments will tell if the powers that be in the USA are prepared to respond with practical deeds to major Soviet proposals pointing a way out of the nuclear deadlock. As for the USSR, it is prepared to cooperate extensively with all those who act from positions of reason, goodwill and awareness of their responsibility for ensuring a future without wars or weapons for mankind.

'Highly Conflicting Statements'

LD090043 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 8 Feb 86

[Valentin Zorin commentary from the "Moscow Viewpoint" program]

[Excerpts] One of the most acute and major issues today is Washington's reaction to the extremely important proposals made by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on the 15th of last month. The initial reaction of the White House was favorable. President Reagan noted the importance and constructive character of Mikhail Gorbachev's statement. True, this was couched in the most general terms, but the very fact that Washington had this time departed from the, alas, memorable practice of dismissing Soviet proposals out of hand was regarddd as a positive fact by the public everywhere, the Soviet Union included.

After the initial reaction of the White House, which I mentioned, there followed a series of highly conflicting statements by various ranking officials of the administration. Their aim was clearly to belittle and distort the Soviet proposals and weaken their tremendous impact on the world public. At the same time there has to this day been no official detailed reply to the Soviet proposals from Washington. Of course, no one in this country has any illusions that the leadership of the Washington Administration will accept all the Soviet proposals without any reservations. It is also perfectly clear to us in Moscow that the issues involved require the most careful study, but a reply that could be considered a beginning to a constructive dialogue surely doesn't require a practically month-long study. There are plenty of sufficiently qualified experts in Washington to analyze the problems dealt with by the Soviet Union in its proposals. Hence a careful study of important proposals is one thing and what looks more and more like deliberate procrastination is another. The assumption may well be that time will dull the impression produced by the Soviet initiative and then the whole project can be quietly derailed. But the whole world looks to Washington not to come up with petty stratagems and not to engage in political maneuvering but to furnish a constructive answer befitting the scope and level of the issues at stake.

Political Atmosphere 'Not Frozen'

LD100040 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The last few days and weeks have featured major international events very clearly showing the character of 1986, a year which must answer the question of whether Moscow and Washington clocks have been changed to Geneva time, a year of truth, when words are tested by deeds.

As for the Soviet Union, as we know, it acted without procrastination after Geneva. I refer, primarily, to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement in which a broad comprehensive plan for peace and disarmament was put forward. The plan takes the interests of not only the Soviet Union, but also those of the United States and the security interests of all big, medium, and small states into account.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in his interview to the paper L'HUMANITE, accurately and strictly said: The challenge of our age emanates from the fact that human civilization unfortunately created an extremely effective means of self-destruction. It is not even necessary to commit an unprecedented folly or crime for the very worst to happen. It is sufficient to act as has been acted in the conduct of international affairs for millennia specifically, to rely on weapons and military force and to use it when need be. These thousand-year-old traditions must now be ruthlessly broken. They must be flatly renounced, otherwise the problem of mankind's survival may prove insoluble.

Herein lies the essence, here is the core of the unparalleled nature of the contemporary period. The Soviet peace plan has a broad, comprehensive view, an essentially all-world view. It would be a mistake to regard our proposal merely as an invitation to the United States to engage in the materialization of the Geneva spirit or to translate the joint Soviet-U.S. statement into the language of practical action.

No, the Soviet initiative means something more. It is a call to all countries to unite their efforts for the sake of saving earth from nuclear and chemical armaments and naturally, of reliably banning the arms race from space and curtailing [avertyvaniye] conventional weapons. The scale of the tasks now facing mankind requires nonstandard actions and maximum honesty that is so desirable.

The representatives of the present U.S. Administration often reproach the Soviet Union, claiming that instead of engaging in the search for unravelling various complex problems connected with limiting and curtailing the arms race at the negotiating table behind closed doors the Soviets are allegedly hastening to proclaim their ideas through the mass media.

Naturally, that reproach is not justified. It is not justified primarily because the Americans know the Soviet representatives are conducting talks

and are conducting them seriously in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm. The reproach also is not justified because the problems which the nuclear age confronts mankind with affect all countries and people alike. And, incidentally, these problems can only be solved in concert.

The Soviet peace plan is an open presentation of the Soviet view of what can be done to save mankind from a nuclear nightmare. The fact that this plan takes the security of all states, regardless of their relative dimensions, into account essentially creates a prospect for creating definite guarantees so that all countries may enjoy the blessings of peace, the blessings of international security. However, we ask ourselves if the political clocks in Washington have been changed to Geneva time. It will not be easy to answer that question. Here are the facts: The Soviet Union does not have a clear reply thus far from the United States to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement. True, some insipid words were let fall in the United States about it being a step in a positive direction, but, I repeat, there has been no official reply.

The U.S. President and secretary of state's special aide, Nitze, has been touring Europe since 5 January [as heard]. His route is as follows: London, Bonn, and Brussels where the NATO Council session is to be held. And Rowny, special aide of the President and secretary of state, has also embarked on a tour of Asia. He also has a fairly dense route. These two high-ranking Washington envoys have brought, as it were, Washington's prepared reply for consultations with their partners in Europe and Asia. And, after that, it seems, the reply to the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement will be sent to our country.

It is claimed in Washington that the reply should be positive on the whole, but what meaning is given to the word positive in the United States is now simply premature to guess at. We are also aware that no serious correctives have been made since Geneva to the U.S. line of force in international affairs. If anyone needs testimony of this, then such testimony has been given in President Ronald Reagan's recent message to Congress. One message was the State of the Union and another was the administration's legislative initiatives in the coming 1987 fiscal year. There is as much anti-Soviet rhetoric in these messages as is the absolute lack of any kind of modest constructive idea directed at strengthening and preserving peace.

In the U.S. policy arsenal we are again seeing a religious, blind adherence to the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. We see a completely irresistable type of concern for one's own invulnerability while completely ignoring the security interests of other states, an expansion of interference in other people's affairs--essentially the old line of force and, naturally, this line in itself creates huge problems in international relations. I do not want to say nothing has changed in the United States since Geneva. No, of course, the political atmosphere does not appear frozen and something is changing, perhaps some kind of psychological restructuring within political circles and the broad public is being contemplated, including a rebirth of faith and hope in the possibility of restoring detente. This, naturally, is a substantial thing and very promising in the political respect.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

MOSCOW PATRIARCH PIMEN PRAISES GORBACHEV PEACE PROPOSALS

LD231053 Moscow TASS in English 0942 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 23 TASS — The United Nations proclaimed 1986 as International Year of Peace. Patriarch Pimen of Moscow and all Russia said in a talk with a TASS correspondent in this connection:

"The noble desire of the international community, the United Nations, has already brought about a great contribution to the cause of preserving life on earth. It has been made by our country, the Soviet Union. The essence of this contribution has already been formulated with utmost clarity by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in a statement which has already become known all over the world. The program presented by him stresses the need for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, for saving mankind from nuclear homicide, from the arms race and from 'star wars.' The program calls for entering the third millennium without weapons of mass destruction."

Patriarch Pimen stressed that that program of peace reflected the will of the entire Soviet people and was backed by a practical step: The USSR extended its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions by three months.

"It is our conviction that people of goodwill in all countries are aware of the Soviet Union's desire to rid mankind of the threat looming over it," Patriarch Pimen continued. "We expect the USA, too, to show true readiness to protect earth from the threat of war. We began this year with a prayer for peace for all life and we believe that this prayer will not be in vain.

"We men of religion have been bearing and continue to bear a responsibility for the destinies of peace. Man is the king of nature by the will of God almighty. All God's creation was given man so that he should thriftily and benevolently care for it and grief will come to man if he neglects his duty and abuses his obligation to preserve the sacred gift of life on earth.

"It is a shame that the great forces of nature are still being used to develop atomic, chemical and other weapons of homicide while they should be used to meet the needs of the suffering majority of the world population," the patriarch stressed.

Patriarch Pimen pointed out that religious peace workers together with all the other rational people should step up their efforts for lessening international tension. "Everyone can and must by his or her efforts contribute to the early solution of common human problems so that peace and justice should be within the reach of all the peoples without exception. The Russian Orthodox Church, which is preparing to celebrate the millennium of the baptism of Russia, considers efforts for peace to be a substantial aspect of its mission."

Patriarch Pimen concluded: "I want to repeat with fresh hope what I said at the second special session devoted to disarmament of the U.N. General Assembly in New York four years ago: We clearly realize that true peace can only be the fruit of the joint efforts of statesmen and peoples. We are praying that the appeal of our people for embarking on the road of sensible and responsible decisions expected by mankind should reach every heart."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

GORBACHEV SENDS MESSAGES TO EXPLAIN ARMS PROPOSALS

LD241804 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 24 TASS -- The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev has sent messages to R. Alfonsin, president of Argentina, A. Papandreou, prime minister of Greece, Rajiv Gandhi, prime minister of India, M. de la Madrid, president of Mexico, A.H. Mwinyi, president of Tanzania, and O. Palme, prime minister of Sweden, in which he informed them of the new Soviet initiatives in the field of arms limitation and disarmament. The messages lay out the essence of the concrete stage-by-stage programme of complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, advanced by the Soviet Union, given an agreement on banning the development, testing and deployment of space strike arms.

The messages lay emphasis on the question of terminating nuclear weapons tests. Mikhail Gorbachev laid down the motives behind the Soviet Union's action to extend its unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts to March 31, 1986. The messages also point out that the U.S.S.R.'s unilateral moratorium cannot, certainly, be extended ad infinitum. It is vital that all opportunities be tapped to get the imposition of a bilateral Soviet-U.S. moratorium and building on that to move forward -- towards complete and universal prohibition of nuclear tests.

The messages by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee were handed by officials who specially flew to those countries. The leaders of the six countries expressed gratitude for the messages and noted the immense importance of the Soviet Union's new initiative laid out in M. Gorbachev's statement of January 15.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

USSR: BRITISH, FRENCH ROLES IN PROPOSALS DELINEATED

'Practical Support' Needed

LD251032 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 24 Jan 86

[Political observer Lev Semeyko commentary]

[Text] The European aspect of nuclear disarmament holds a prominent place in the new Soviet proposals. The present approach contains some of the elements of the previous ones. For example, in the past too, the Soviet Union proposed ridding Europe of nuclear weapons, medium-range and tactical alike [as heard]. Similarly, when we were having talks with the Americans on medium-range nuclear weapons, we took into account the nuclear arsenals of Britain and France. And still the present Soviet approach greatly differs from the previous one. As it stands now, all the European medium-range missiles are viewed in the context of global and stage-by-stage nuclear disarmament. Emphasis is laid not so much on gradual reductions, as on the elimination of all the nuclear weapons on earth by the year 2000. The elimination procedure is arranged in such a way that not a single side and not a single nuclear state might, in any period, view itself at a disadvantage or its security unilaterally undermined.

Let us see how we should work with regard to the nuclear forces of Britain and France. All that is required of the British and French in the first stage, over a period of 5 to 8 years beginning this year, is to refrain from building up their strategic nuclear missiles. The Americans, during the same stage, would have to pledge not to supply its strategic missiles or medium-range missiles to London and Paris, including Trident-2 missiles to London. At the same time, the Soviet Union and the United States would reduce by one half the number of nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territories. Besides in the first 5 to 8 years, the Soviet Union would scrap all the SS-20 and SS-4 missiles deployed in the European zone, while the United States would eliminate its Pershings and cruise missiles deployed in Western Europe.

his gives obvious advantages to the British and the French. The Soviet and American nuclear potentials would become commensurate with those of Britain and France, and not a single Soviet medium-range missile would be targeted against either of the two countries.

In the second stage, to begin no later than 1990 and continue for 5 to 7 years, the other nuclear powers, Britain and France included, should begin to join in the process of nuclear disarmament. At first,they would pledge to freeze all their nuclear weapons and not to have any on the territory of other countries. After that, with the Soviet Union and the United States completing the 50 percent reductions of their

corresponding weapons in the second stage, all the nuclear powers should do away with their tactical weapons, that is weapons with a radius of up to 1,000 km. In the same second stage, all the nuclear powers would stop testing nuclear weapons.

Will the security of Britain or France be undermined at that stage? Of course it will not. They would still retain their strategic nuclear forces at that stage. In other words, the Soviet Union will not mind if, within the framework of general and complete nuclear disarmament, Britain and France retain their strategic nuclear weapons for 10 and even more years.

Yet in the third stage, to begin no later than 1995, all the remaining nuclear weapons of all the nuclear powers would have to be scrapped by 1999.

There aren't any hidden tricks in the Soviet program of nuclear disarmament. It precludes any chance for anyone to obtain unilateral advantages. It represents a clearcut plan of joint and energetic efforts over a period of 15 years to rid our planet of nuclear weapons. The Soviet plan is a complex one, yet its backbone is to estroy nuclear weapons. How will London and Paris respond to it? Mere approval, if of course any official approval comes, is not enough. What is needed is active and practical support. If such support is provided, Europe will soon have neither SS-20's nor Euro-missiles nor United States-made Trident or any other nuclear weapons.

'Special Mission' for Europe

LD231724 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 23 Jan 86

[Vladimir Chernyshev commentary headlined "A Special Mission" and subheaded "The Role of Europe in the Disarmament Process"]

[Text] Moscow, January 23 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

In the program, which the Soviet Union has put forward with a view to removing the threat of an all-out war and which constitutes a many-sided and detailed complex of proposals, a considerable part of initiatives is addressed to Europe. And this is not a fortuity. It is precisely our continent, which is literally stuffed with military bases and tools of death, that has not become a much more explosive focus of the newest destruction weapons than the most refined science fiction writer of the past could imagine. At the same time it is precisely little Europe, which is too fragile to fight wars, that possesses unique historical experience in the positive solution of matters of detente. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference may serve as a concrete example of new mentality and political psychology in an approach to the problems of peace, cooperation and international detente.

hat is why, alongside the USSR and the USA, that, setting an example to other nuclear powers must start the process of nuclear disarmament, Europe could assume a special mission in making a sharp turn toward the policy of peace. This mission is detente-building.

According to the Soviet proposals, the decision on complete elimination of medium-range missiles of the USSR and the USA in the European zone, both ballistic and cruise missiles, would be implemented, as an initial step on the road of ridding the European Continent of nuclear weapons, already at the first stage of the three-stage programme for complete elimination of nuclear arms in the world. At the same time, the United States should undertake not to transfer its strategic and medium-range missiles to other countries, while Britain and France should pledge not to build up their respective nuclear arms.

At the second stage, tactical nuclear weapons would first be frozen, and then destroyed and there would be a ban on the development of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles, whose destructive capacity is close to that of nuclear arms or other weapons of mass destruction. And, finally, the elimination of all remaining nuclear weapons would be completed at the third stage.

All this would enable West European countries to rid themselves of first-strike nuclear missiles being deployed in their territories, to reject the role of the Pentagon's "nuclear hostages" imposed on them by the United States, to remove forever the tendency of the worsening of the conditions of the European security threatening them now. The Gordian knot would thus be cut and the entire continent would heave a sigh of relief.

The Soviet Union suggested that alongside the elimination of mass destruction weapons, conventional armaments and armed forces should be subject to agreed upon reductions. Europe can make a great contribution and fulfil it in this aspect, too. The beginning to this can be set at the Vienna talks on the reduction of forces and armaments in central Europe. Use must be made also of the opportunities that appeared at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe. The Soviet proposals to those forums provide weighty enough grounds for this. By the way, even the head of the U.S. delegation to the Stockholm Conference Robert Barry had to admit at a press conference in the State Department on January 22 that Mikhail Gorbachev had given a certain political impetus to that conference and that his call for a successful conclusion of the conference was an optimistic sign.

The European public, sane politicians in West European countries highly appreciate the opportunities offered by the Soviet programme, describe it as the most comprehensive initiative in the sphere of disarmament ever advanced by a great power. According to the French newspaper LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS, NATO experts arrive at the conclusion that the document contains a certain number of compromise proposals and innovatory ideas that merit attention.

It is now extremely important that West European countries should give a serious, well thought-out answer to the Soviet initiative. This answer must be based on a realistic appraisal of the situation in the world, must be imbued with real concern for peace in Europe and all over the world.

Gorbachev Reportedly Asks Kohl's Support

AU271601 Paris AFP in English 1555 GMT 27 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, Jan 27 (AFP) -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has asked West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl for support in realising the January 15 Soviet arms proposals aimed at the total suppression of nuclear weapons, a report here says.

A letter to Chancellor Kohl from Mr. Gorbachev, reported in tomorrow's edition of the mass-circulation BILD ZEITUNG, said it is "high time, given the over-worrying international situation, to follow through on words of action."

The U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative, he warned, runs "counter to hopes for a reduction and, eventually, a liquidation of nuclear armaments on earth," the letter, transmitted on January 16, said.

Mr. Gorbachev reiterated the Soviet Union's decision to extend, by three months, a unilateral halt on nuclear tests that had expired December 31.

Turning to his proposals for a nuclear-free Europe, Mr. Gorbachev told Mr. Kohl that he insisted that the United States should agree not to deliver U.S. weapons to its European allies, and that Britain and France must not increase their own nuclear arsenals.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

GORBACHEV PROPOSAL HAILED IN SOVIET ARMY PAPER EDITORIAL

PM271032 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Cause of Each and Every One"]

[Text] The attention of the Soviet people, their friends abroad, and the world public remains focused on the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on disarmament questions. The Soviet Union's new, major, and fundamental foreign policy initiatives were enthusiastically received by the planet's peace-loving circles at large and all progressive mankind.

The Soviet proposals accurately define the specific objectives, methods, machinery, and schedule for the attainment of comprehensive disarmament. An accurately timed program for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons everywhere with the prohibition of space strike weapons, put forward for the first time in the nuclear age, is the core of this large-scale package. The recently published message from the USSR Supreme Soviet to the U.S. Congress stresses again that mankind must enter the 3d millennium free from the burden of the most destructive weapons which threaten the life of all people.

The new decisive actions undertaken by the Soviet Union in defense of peace and for the improvement of the international situation are an expression of the essence and spirit of our domestic and foreign policies, of their organic fusion, and of the fundamental historic law which Vladimir Ilich Lenin stressed and which our party firmly follows. The Land of the Soviets hoists even higher the banner of peace, freedom, and humanism, which the Great October unfurled over the planet.

There can be no outsiders or neutral people when the issue concerns the preservation of peace and mankind's deliverance from the threat of nuclear war, the statement says. This is the cause of each and every one. The contribution of each state, large or small, socialist or capitalist, is important here. The contribution of each responsible political party, of each public organization, of each person, is important here. No task is more imperative, more noble, or more humane than to fuse together all efforts for the attainment of this lofty goal. This task has to be performed by people of our generation, without shifting it onto the shoulders of our descendants. The Soviet people are profoundly aware of this responsibility and act of correspondingly. Our people ardently approve and actively support the party's international policy, which stems from the socialist society's humane nature. It is inseparably linked with the strategic tasks of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development and improving socialism and expresses the Soviet people's single desire -- to engage in creative labor and to live in peace with all peoples.

Guided by the will of the people, the CPSU and the Soviet State are doing everything within their power to solve the problem of the liquidation of nuclear weapons, which is of importance for the whole of mankind. Within the context of the measures undertaken for this purpose, the Soviet Union made an important decision -- it extended its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests for 3 months. The Soviet people acclaim this step. At the same time, they approve the warning, contained in the statement, that the Soviet Union cannot display unilateral restraint as regards nuclear tests indefinitely. This warning is even more topical in view of the fact that the United States disregarding all appeals and despite public demands, has so far failed to join the Soviet moratorium and is continuing to detonate more and more new nuclear devices.

The situation prevailing in the world arena does not allow the Soviet people to lower their guard. Facts testify that, hiding behind peace-loving rhetoric, the U.S. side is continuing its pursuit of the unattainable dream of military superiority and has not given up the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike arms. Influential U.S. circles are conducting an offensive against the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. Statements aimed against the "spirit of Geneva" are uttered from authoritative rostrums. And the point is that matters are not restricted to just statements. Actions are undertaken which are clearly calculated to fan hostility and mistrust and to revive the conditions of confrontation.

The Soviet Union rejects these types of actions and thinking. The Soviet State, on behalf of its people, has repeatedly warned that the United States will never be allowed to smash the military-strategic equilibrium. M.S. Gorbachev's statement says once more and most definitely that our material and intellectual potential ensures for the Soviet union the opportunity to create [sozdaniye] any weapon, if we are forced to do this.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program points out that, for as long as there exists a danger that imperialism may unleash aggression, military conflicts, and various provocations, it is necessary to devote unflagging attention to the strengthening of the Soviet defense might and the consolidation of its security. The CPSU will apply all efforts to ensure that the Soviet Armed Forces are at a level precluding strategic superiority by the forces of imperialism, that the Soviet State's defense capability is comprehensively improved, and that the combat community of armies of the fraternal socialist countries is strengthened.

Wholly approving the party's Leninist foreign policy course, the Soviet people ensure its practical implementation by means of their selfless labor which is aimed at strengthening the motherland's economic and defense might. This has been and still remains the cause of each and every one in our country. The faster and more successfully the tasks of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development are resolved, the more conscientious and more efficient every single person's labor becomes and the higher organization and discipline become our socialist fatherland will be that much richer, its positions will be that much firmer, and its voice will be that much more authoritative in the international arena.

The deeds, aspirations, and concerns of the whole people are also shared by the servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces, who bear a particular responsiblity for the country's defense capabilty and for the protection of the gains of socialism. Turning to M.S. Gorbachev's statement, fully approving it, and drawing the necessary conclusions from it, they perceive it as their duty to display lofty vigilance in everything and to always be prepared to block imperialism's intrigues against the Soviet Union and its allies and to crush any aggressor.

The entire political and economic atmosphere in our country is now conditioned by the approaching 27th CPSU Congress. The party is approaching it with a Leninist program for a further advancement toward communism and the struggle for peace and international security. The active support for this strategic course by the whole Soviet people -- support in both words and deeds -- is the source of our optimism and of our confidence in the correctness of the chosen path and in the fact that the plans will definitely be fulfilled.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

TASS: SOVIET ARMS PROPOSAL SEEN AS 'BLUEPRINT' FOR PEACE

LD261048 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT 26 Jan 86

[Text] Brussels, January 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports: The proposals made in a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on disarmament issues are a large-scale and concrete plan for ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear disaster, Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice-president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and a member of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, told a news conference here. He is staying in Brussels at the invitation of the Belgian Parliament's Foreign Relations Commission.

What is needed to fulfil the plan, he said, is the good will of all nuclear powers and their political striving to do away with nuclear weapons. The Soviet program presupposes that outer space remains free from any arms. This means that the United States should renounce its "star wars" program because its implementation would scuttle the entire process of limiting arms and open the way to outer space to all classes of weapons.

The Soviet proposals, the scientist said in an answer to a journalist's question, imply not only quantitative but also qualitative reductions of arms. They are a true blueprint for improving the international situation. Mankind is now at the crossroads and everything hinges on the choice it makes. A general end to nuclear testing could be a step in the right direction. "We hope that the United States will joint the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions," Velikhov said.

He had a meeting with members of the Belgian Parliament's Foreign Relations Commission.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

SHEVARDNADZE INTERVIEWED DURING VISIT TO MONGOLIA

LD261515 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 26 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Ulaanbaatar, 26 Jan TASS-MONTSAME--During an official friendly visit to the Mongolian People's Republic, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Foreign Minister, gave an interview to the Mongolian News Agency MONTSAME. Follows the full text of the interview:

Question: Comrade Minister, what is your view of the prospects of the Soviet-American relations in the light of last year's Geneva summit and the Soviet Union's new initiative advanced in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev?

Answer: It stands to reason that the prospects of our relations with the United States depend on the intentions and readiness of both sides to implement the arrangements reached at the summit level between the USSR and the USA in Geneva. As to our intentions, we welcome the created preconditions for a turn for the better and are determined to overcome what Mikhail Gorbachev described as a "period of estrangement" between the Soviet Union and the United States.

As is known, we have held and hold that questions of security must be central to the talks of top leaders of the USSR and the USA. Precisely those questions were the main subject of the discussions, though no concrete agreements related to this sphere have been worked out in Geneva.

But it has been agreed there that the sides will accelerate the work at their negotiations on nuclear and space arms and, what is very important, the arrangement of January 8, 1985, has been confirmed that their objective will be to terminate the arms race on earth and prevent it in space, and that the efforts of the sides in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction must ultimately be aimed at the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere.

The proposals advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev mean in their significance a program of truly a historic scope, they set essentially in a new way the very task of ensuring security in the nuclear age. In this sense Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, naturally, goes far beyond the framework of the present state of the Soviet-U.S. contacts and negotiations.

It was addressed to all states, all governments and we would like all countries, nuclear and non-nuclear, large and small, to promote the establishment of a world without nuclear arms, without mass destruction weapons alt

At the same time it is clear that a practical implementation of the idea of a world without nuclear arms depends, particularly in the initial stage, above all on the achievement an appropriate mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States. These two countries, having the biggest arsenals of nuclear arms, must set the example of their radical reduction.

Proceeding from this, we offered as an initial step the implementation of 50 percent cuts in the nuclear arms of the USSR and the USA reaching each other's territories, combined with a ban on the creation of space arms, and other steps for the limitation of military activity and for coordination of efforts at international forums in disarmament.

If we agreed that within five years the USSR and the USA would eliminate half of their nuclear arms, which are the point of the matter, then, I am sure, not a single nuclear country could keep apart from the solution of the problem of the complete elimination of nuclear arms.

Proposing n w a detailed, realistic concept of the advance to a future without nuclear arms, the Soviet side is in practice that on which understanding was reached in Geneva.

We believe the working out of concrete arrangements on the initial volumes and deadlines of the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction must become t e main, central items of the coming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

The Soviet Union now suggests a direct way
it confirms this by its own tangible actions. The USSR has put a new solid advance on the balance of peace -- it extended for three months its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

If the U.S. Administration takes this new opportunity offered to it and stops nuclear weapons tests, this will, naturally, create a more favourable background for a meeting of the top leaders of the two countries. If it does not do so, the atmop ere in our relations will look different, also, specifically, in the aspect of the summit dialogue.

I believe it is not we alone but also people everywhere, who expect from the U.S. side deeds, not words. They wait for a clear-cut answer. Termination of nuclear explosions is precisely such an answer. If one side does not hold such explosions, then why shouldn't the other side to likewise?

Those who wish nuclear arms to be destroyed cannot be upgrading and building them up, the way the United States is doing. Washington must honestly show to the whole world what its stand is. And this is easy to do: Suffice it to stop testing nuclear weapons. No nuclear explosions would be held in Nevada, they would not be shaking the earth and there would be no need to waste thousands of words to prove good intentions.

What is it that prevents the U.S. Administration from sending to the world a signal of peace, not the new convulsion of a nuclear explosion?

The U.S. side invoked the problem of verification. But this problem is non-existent now. The statement by Mikhail Gorbachev clearly says that the Soviet Union is prepared to use any forms of verification -- national technical means, international mechanisms and on-site inspections.

The situation that has shaped up now is crystal clear: either the U.S. side is for ridding mankind from the nuclear threat and in this case it should display readiness for discussing and drafting a concrete programme for clearing the earth from this deadly weapon, or it looks for ways to pile up nuclear arms and to make a nuclear war possible.

A constructive and businesslike stand is also expected from the United States at the talks on nuclear and space arms. I repeat: These are talks on nuclear and space arms. The U.S. Administration and we have agreed not only on their name but also on the face that the afore-mentioned issues will be examined and solved in their interrelationship. We see so far the readiness to speak in Geneva only on one side of the integral formula which was adopted by both sides. In other words, the U.S.S.R. has already taken enormous steps towards solving the task of eliminating nuclear and other mass destruction armaments. Only words and nothing else are heard from the U.S. side. The ball is now in the U.S. court.

Question: What is your impression about the impact of the Soviet Union's new initiative on the situation in Asia as seen during your visits to Japan and DPRK?

Answer: It is absolutely obvious to me that the proposals contained in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, the proposals that, for their nature, are of interest to entire humanity, meet directly the aspirations of all peoples.

This is confirmed also by the comments on the statement in different countries. Statesmen and politicians, prominent scientists, specialists in the sphere of the military policy come out in support of the peace programme, atoms for peace.

I believe that the special statement adopted by the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic in support of the new Soviet initiative expresses the feelings not only of the Mongolian people but also of the millions of people everywhere in the world. They realise that the Soviet Union offered an innovatory programme of ensuring international security for the 21st century, the programme suiting the realities and needs of the times.

During the visits to Japan and the DPRK in conversations with leaders of the Mongolian People's Republic, it was noted that the idea of ridding the earth of nuclear and chemical weapons, of other mass destruction weapons advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev, coincides with long-term national interests of each one of these countries. This cannot be otherwise for a world without mass destruction weapons means a more tranquil and confident life for everyone, the guarantee of preserving life itself.

Certainly, the assessments of Mikhail Gorbachev's initiative are affected by differences that are brought about by the political system and political orientation, for instance, of Mongolia and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, on the one hand, and Japan -- on the other. But common is also the idea that the realization of the new Soviet initiative would contribute towards bringing a fundamental change in the world situation, would enable those countries to start implementing long-term peaceful socio-economic programmes. It would become possible to pool the efforts of states in tackling problems that are faced by the whole of mankind.

This thinking is quite natural. To realize the entire significance of Mikhail Gorbachev's initiative, it is suffice [as received] to compare two possible variants of developments.

One is based on the premise that nuclear, chemical and other types of weapons will be preserved, perfected and built-up. In this case a question at once arises: To what limits can this be done with impunity, thoughtlessly and all but automatically?

The other is the non-nuclear variant under which mass destruction weapons will be eliminated. In this case a totally different prospect, a prospect holding out hope, is opened up, that of peaceful endeavour, of channelling huge funds now spent on armaments into the goals of peaceful construction, the tackling of economic and financial problems that are a heavy burden for peoples, particularly, in developing countries.

The following reality should by all means also be taken into consideration in comparing these two forecasts: If it is not so easy to agree on measures to limit and cut armaments, as is shown by practice, then to build armaments and create new ones is by far easier. We slide towards the nuclear threat as if from an icy hill. One has to ascend an arduous road to achieve disarmament.

It is hardly that any sensible person will prefer insecure world of fear to secure non-nuclear future.

If one is to talk specifically about Asia, I do not see a country here that could lose anything from the realization of the programme proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev. I am sure that the absolute majority of states in this region do not want to have nuclear and chemical weapons even near their borders.

Look how strong sentiments in favour of ridding the world completely of nuclear weapons are growing in Asia.

The proposal of the Mongolian People's Republic to work out a convention on non-aggression and non-use of force among the Asian and Pacific states, the United Nations resolution "on the right of peoples to peace," adopted on its initiative, other steps taken by the Republic to improve the international situation, are consonant with the statements of Asian and other peoples. These proposals are fully in keeping with what is offered by Mikhail Gorbachev's statement.

One can put it in this way: The earth is a single whole and there must be no nuclear weapons anywhere -- either in Europe, or in Asia, or in Latin American, or anywhere else. I shall emphasise that we do not wish to have it in our country either. Mikhail Gorbachev stated this quite definitely.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

USSR: SOVIET PROPOSAL TERMED A REALIZABLE 'DREAM'

LD271053 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 Jan 86

[Commentary by Fedor Burlatskiy, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer; from "The International Panorama" program]

[Excerpts] Hello comrades! Eleven days have passed since the statement by Comrade Gorbachev was published. Yet the wave of reaction to it does not decrease, but grows. Following the speeches by the leaders of various states, the discussion of our proposals was joined by the press, radio, and television in practically every country of the world. My attention was drawn to a phrase in one of the commentaries which reads: Gorbachev's dream, this appraisal is addressed to the idea of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and this appraisal is expressed not without some sympathy, but with some doubt, perhaps, as to the feasibility [realnost] of such a task.

It is too good, it says, to be believable. Is this a joke? The elimination of all nuclear arsenals numbering 55,000 warheads; the arsenals which belong to five great powers -- the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and China. It is some kind of a joke, to come to an agreement on the positions [soglasovas' pozitsii] of all these states and take into account each of their security interests? Individual elements, touching principally on the talks taking place in Geneva now, are generally taken from the statement on the 50-percent cut in strategic weapons, the intermediate decision on intermediate-range missiles, and the chemical weapons ban. Of course, the solution to these problems has great inherent significance. But why does the central idea -- the idea of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the whole world -- why is this idea left to one side?

No matter how complex this task is, no matter how difficult it may be to agree to the positions of the Soviet Union, the United States, and the other nuclear powers, we must all know where we are going and what kind of final goals we have. This kind of approach will help us agree on a state-by-stage intermediate solution.

However, I heard the word dream in this context -- in the context of the struggle against the nuclear threat -- way back in Geneva where I was during the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. One of the U.S. journalists told me that President Reagan spoke about his dream during the famous fireside conversation between the two leaders of our powers. And in fact, in one of his first speeches, after the meeting, President REagan spoke about this conversation; I quote: I explained, the President said, our Strategic Defense Initiative and our research program which envisages the possibility of creating defense systems which could, in the final analysis, defend all states from the threat of nuclear war. Mankind would at last cease to be prisoners of terror before each other. This is my dream, said the President.

So the leader of the United States, which was the first to create the atomic bomb and begin the arms race, now dreams of how to make his country safe -- and other countries as well, he says -- from the fear of nuclear weapons. How though? By creating even more fantastic weaponry? Is this a new idea? Maybe it is an original invention specifically for nuclear strategy which the ordinary human mind is not capable of comprehending? It is no such thing. The U.S. President was rightly told in Geneva: It is much easier to eliminate all nuclear weapons than to create space strike systems. Why spend tens of hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars and pile up mountains of space weapons alongside nuclear ones? Where is the sense in this?

Now the whole world, all nuclear and non-nuclear states, and all international public opinion have in front of them the Soviet plan to liberate the earth from nuclear weapons by the end of this century. It is indeed a concrete, balanced, and business-like plan; in which our proposals are clearly defined at each state of the whole process of nuclear disarmement. Is this a dream? Yes, if you like, it is a dream, but only in the same sense in which Herbert Wells, the famous fantasy writer, spoke of Lenin's dream of creating a new society on the ruins of bleeding Russia. You remember, of course, that Wells called Lenin the Kremlin dreamer. It can now be seen how beautiful a dream is when it sets noble aims and when it accords with the people's hopes. Such a dream blends with reality and serves as a reliable footbridge to tomorrow.

So our partners in the countries of the West [as heard] may not agree with all the elements of the proposed plan. To begin with, only the tasks of the first stage of disarmament will be solved. This will already be a major victory on the road to the final goal. Let them ponder once more the question where all the states targeting their aim of creating new types of weapons are. The dream of a space shield disintegrates when brough into contact with the plan for a stage-by-stage destruction of the whole nuclear missile potential.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

USSR'S 'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM EXAMINES NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

LD271537 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 27 Jan 86

["Top Priority" program presented by Vladimir Posner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Studies Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text][Posner] Hello, and welcome to Top Priority. Today on the panel we have our usual members: Dr Radomir Bogdanov, Dr Sergey Plekhanov, both of the USA and Canada Studies Institute, and your host is Vladimir Posner. The topic I'd like to discuss with you gentlemen today is that of two approaches to the issue of nuclear disarmament. We know that the United States, as its presidents have said in the past, is against nuclear weapons, it's for nuclear disarmament. The Soviet Union has made that statement many times, and yet there seems to be a very serious difference in the way the two countries approach that issue and perhaps the latest proposals that were very clearly enunciated in the statement of Mikhail Gorbachev might serve as a way to show up these differences. Who would like to take the ball Dr Bodganov?

[Bogdanov] You know, I've been following very closely the American reaction to our proposal and you wouldn't be surprised because it's quite natural, after all it's my job. But not only that, that it's my job, but even from the human point of view I'm very interested, you know, how America, official, unofficial America, reacts to our, to my mind, historical and very important proposal. Now, let me make some points about that. You know, my feeling is that you come across several levels of reaction to the Soviet proposal. Let me start with the official reaction which is of course very important one. And while talking about the official reaction let me also to make a little bit difference within that. [as heard] You know I mean, by that one, I mean the presidential statement on Mikhail Gorbachev's declaration which is very interesting to my mind. The president said we are grateful to them for their proposals. Then the President said that ("he hears) for the first time such a proposal, such a comprehensive proposal. So it sounds very positive, you know, and he said of course that he will study it carefully and so on and so on. And, you know, to my surprise, to come across some other think like, you know, we cannot trust Russians. There is nothing new in their proposals. There are bits of very old Soviet propositions (?piecing) together. Then what do you hear? You hear (?falsification and) distortion of those proposals. For instance, the most important, or one of the most important parts of our proposals, verification (?problems) is just distorted by very high up in the American administration.

And, you know, you come across some very strange things so let me dwell a little bit on that. You just stated that American side has been stating for quite a number of

years that they are for getting rid of nuclear arms and their own President also stated that several times and some other people, very important people in the administration. But what do you hear now? You hear how some rather important voices stating that no, we have to live with the nuclear arms, we are so used to nuclear arms that how can we deal with this new world without nuclear arms? And still they say they are for deterrence. How can we live without nuclear arms?

Now, let me be little bit, you know, nasty, asking my American listeners over there where is the truth? Are they for elimination of nuclear arms or they are for still using them? You know, I am really puzzled by that kind of, you know, contradiction in the American position.

[Posner] Dr Plekhanov, you wanted to say something at that point?

[Plekhanov] Yes, yes, I think that this commitment to nuclear disarmament on the part of the U.S. government is far, far from clear. The only connection in which they have spoken about that is the President's SDI proposal which was packaged a couple of years ago as a way to rid the earth of nuclear weapons if possible. Now, but there are several (?hedges) here. In the first place nobody is sure that the SDI will ever work.

[Posner] Most people are sure it won't.

[Plekhanov] Most people are sure that they [as heard] won't. And also, if you step down from the level of presidential grand statement to the level of the, to the operational level, of people like General Abrahamson and other people at the Pentagon who are in the business of working on SDI, they more and more emphasize that the purpose of the SDI is to enhance the nuclear deterrent mechanism which exists in the United States so the SDI is more and more put forward as an addition to the existing nuclear arsenal.

[Posner] Right.

[Plekhanov] And, which is exactly the point, that it's not an anti-nuclear thing. It's something that will make the nuclear balance far less stable, far more dangerous.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov, I'd like to get back to what you were saying. I found it very interesting when you were talking about the different types of official reactions and you mentioned what President Reagan had said and then some other people. Are you suggesting that there might be a kind of different view of all of this inside the administration itself?

[Bogdanov] To be frank with you, Vladimir, I wouldn't like to talk about that. It's too sensitive and I wouldn't like to sound impolite. I leave it to my American listeners, to American citizens, to judge by themselves what's going on in the administration. I'm just stating some facts. That's all. That's my [words indistinct]. Now, let me take another question which has been in my mind for quite a number of days. You know, as you remember, as my friend Sergey put it just now, SDI, famous SDI or "star wars", whatever it is, first of all was (?designed, was) meant as a tool to eliminate all nuclear weapons. A way to make them obsolete...

[Posner interrupting] That's the way the President...

[Bogdanov resumes] And to make, that's the way the President, the President, that was after all his explanation why it was so badly needed for (?USA). Now I recognize that there is a very big gap between American mentality and Russian mentality. They are quite different, due to different reasons, historical, political, things like that. Maybe I am wrong, but with my Russian modest mentality I cannot understand if really American (?society) is aiming at elimination of nuclear arms why they don't accept our proposal to really eliminate them within very short period of time, 15 years, with three stages which our American listeners know [words indistinct]. But my point is why for you should build that huge thing with multi, multibillion of dollars spent at least, without, a trillion dollar, without any, any clear, you know, end, still nobody knows that will work or not. You first build it.

You test it, (?then), then let's get rid of nuclear arms. That's, my Russian logic is revolting against that, I'm sorry to say...

[Posner, interrupting] Well, I think American...

[Bogdanov] Maybe, maybe, Vladimir you can explain how the American mind works in that (?way) where is the logic?

[Posner] American common sense is something that is quite well known and I think that that would probably, it would probably agree with you. But I'd like to come back to one thing that you've been talking about and also you, Dr Plekhanov, and that is, you have said that, and agreed with me, that in the past American leadership has consistently said that it is against, it would like to get rid of nuclear weapons. But, however, this has not been possible, for a variety of reasons. Now we come to a point where there is a kind of proposal that makes it realistic to be able to get rid of nuclear weapons and, as you said, Dr Bogdanov, there are some people in the American administration who now are claiming, well we don't really want to get rid of them at all. (?Don't you) think that perhaps what was said in the past about wishing to get rid of them was said precisely because the people saying it (?thought) that they could get away with it because there was no real way of getting rid of nuclear weapons? But, now that they feel there is they have no choice but to admit their real view. Do you, do you think that that might be true?

[Plekhanov] I think that's an accurate description of what took place and I think you're a little exaggerating even the former commitment of the U.S. government to the idea of nuclear disarmament. I guess that the only time that they really tried to put it into, to put this commitment, to make this commitment, and to put it into more or less serious language was during the Kennedy administration when there was a joint Soviet-American plan for general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament. Because at other times whenever we would put forward a proposal for nuclear disarmament there would always be all kinds of humming and hawing and, you know, all kinds of objections and so on. And recently we've seen a revival of this talk about nuclear disarmament in connection with the SDI. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating. What we are now offering is a practical, a realistic, down to earth fair plan for nuclear disarmament.

[Posner] How do you feel about the latest American arguments against the proposals in the statement of the General Secretary of the Soviet Union's Communist Party [words indistinct] and that is that you can't trust the Soviet's because when they propose a moratorium they themselves break what they promise to do, you can't trust the Soviets because of this, because of that, what are these arguments worth really? Do you think... What is your assessment? How powerful are they? How many people do you think will buy those arguments?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, those are (strong) arguments. Why? They are strong because they have no ground, you know. If you tried to support any of them by facts then, it's OK, then the real difficulty arises because they have (?no facts). But if you just say you cannot trust them because they're bloody communists or something like that, I'm really helpless, I have no, I haven't the arguments to contradict them. But, you know, let me begin with some others. They don't trust us. But let me say to my American, (?the) respected American listeners, that we don't trust them too, and we have more of them, plenty of, you know, reasons that we don't trust Americans, that we are very doubtful about the American [words indistinct] but it's like that you know, rightly or wrongly. They don't trust us, then want to do in this situation what, maybe the reasonable anthropological answer: OK lets build kind of a bridge between two ends and try to build a kind of, you know, mutual trust. How? There is many ways and means but we suggest one very concrete and very efficient, verification, verification. And if you have a look at our proposal you will see that any line, concrete line, we suggest to U.S. (?state) is supported by our proposal, verification.

Not only verification, but that the confirmation of [words indistinct] verification, national technical means, international inspections [words indistinct]. And we state if they are not satisfied with that we are open to discuss with them any other kind of verification. What I mean by that? Let's stop talking about trust or not trust. OK, we admit there is no trust. But let's do something positive just to enhance mutual trust if that's the way (?to do it). But if you say we cannot trust them just because we cannot trust them then it becomes hopelessly [word indistinct].

[Plekhanov] Yes, I would like to recall a quote from Henry Simpson, who was the Secretary of War in the Truman Administration. I think it was Simpson who said that in order to make a person trustworthy you should trust them and the best way to make somebody untrustworthy is to mistrust them, which is, I think, a really wise observation and the problem with a lack of trust has been key to this business of the arms race and the inability to put an end to it. If one just refers to the lack of trust and does nothing in order to enhance this trust then it is really hopeless. So, I think that the proposal which has been put forward is very practical in the sense, in many senses, and one aspect of the practicality is that it meets this persistent argument on the [words indistinct] American side that really we are doubtful whether it can be verified, wehther we can trust. In our proposal we have been, we have tried in good faith to offer Americans a practical means of allaying their fears and suspicions in connection with the possible disarmament measures. There are to be adequate measures in all these agreements which we may reach with the United States on disarmament in order to make sure that the treaties are adhered to and nobody is cheating.

[Posner] In conclusion I would like to tell you both a kind of an anecdote that I heard recently from a friend of mine, an American who was visiting Moscow, and he said, you know, many years ago in America it used to be said that the word no was a Russian word because it was always the Russians, it seemed to us, who said nyet, no. But now, in past years and especially nowadays I have the feeling that no has become an American word because every time the Soviets make a proposal in the area of arms limitations or reductions it's the Americans who say no.

[Plekhanov] In other words they wouldn't take yes for an answer.

[Posner] Exactly. But I'm hoping that they will and I'm hoping that 1986 will indeed prove to be a breakthrough year in that area, notwithstanding all of the concerns and doubts that you gentlemen have voiced and I certainly share with you. We'll be talking about these things in future programs so I invite all of our listeners to tune in at the same time a week from today for our next edition of Top Priority.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

DISARMAMENT TALKS BEGIN; POSSIBILITIES ASSESSED

Israelyan Focuses on CW

LD281450 Moscow TASS in English 1443 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 28 TASS -- The delegations of the USSR and the USA started bilateral discussions in Geneva today in accordance with the arrangements between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan to accelerate efforts to conclude an effective and verifiable international convention on general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and destruction of the existing stockpiles of such weapons and to intensify bilateral discussions on the level of experts on all aspects of such a chemical weapons ban, including the questions of verification.

The USSR delegation at these discussions is headed by Ambassador Viktor Israelyan, the United States delegation by Ambassador Donald Lowitz.

The Soviet-American discussion of the questions of the prohibition of chemical weapons, V. Israelyan told newsman before the opening of the talks, must absorb the impulse of the November meeting of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States. These discussions are called upon to promote above all the quest for solutions of the fundamental aspects of the convention on general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of their stockpiles.

The Soviet Union, as this is said in the statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev of January 15 this year, considers as fully feasible the task of completely eliminating even in this century such barbaric weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons and is in favor of an early and complete elimination of those weapons and of the industrial base for their production.

Wishing to accelerate talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons, the Soviet Union has expressed the readiness for a timely declaration of the location of enterprises producing chemical weapons and for the cessation of their production, the readiness to start developing procedures for destroying the relevant industrial base and to proceed, soon after the convention enters into force, to eliminating the stockpiles of chemical weapons. The Soviet delegation hopes that the bilateral discussions will be proceeding in a constructive, businesslike atmosphere and will be promoting a speedy advance toward a general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons.

Israelyan Press Conference

PM281507 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 25 Jan 86 p 7

["L.H." report: "Soviet Expert Reiterates: Space Weapons and Nuclear Arms Cannot Be Separated"]

[Text] Space weapons and nuclear arms are two sides of the same coin and cannot be separated. It is possible to achieve a liquidation of all chemical weapons within this decade. The Soviet peace plan is a balanced, realistic, and comprehensive plan which, despite Western reactions, does not simply cover nuclear arms and a first step [toward total disarmament].

This was stated by Soviet Ambassador Israelyan, who heads his country's delegation in Geneva, yesterday at a press conference in Helsinki, after he had taken part in discussions with Prime Minister Sorsa and leading Foreign Ministry officials.

Ambassador Israelyan described Gorbachev's aim with the peace program as politically significant, concrete, and comprehensive in concept. According to Israelyan, there has been far too much talk about first steps when the program actually goes into both space and nuclear arms and into other types of armament and covers negotiations in many forums.

Israelyan said of the character of the proposal -- its idea -- that it is impossible to implement it overnight; it will require long and intensive negotiations and a lot of work. He stressed time and time again the degree of concreteness of the proposal and, for his own part, said that the three stages covering 15 years were not simply plucked from the air of utopia, but take into account the concrete situation and the attitudes of various sides in a balanced way. "We are not after bilateral solutions, but we think it is possible to begin the process through agreements between the two leading superpowers," the ambassador said.

According to Israelyan, the first step chiefly affects the United States and the Soviet Union; later others would be included and would freeze their nuclear arsenals and make smaller limitations as far as tactical weapons are concerned. Only then would it be time for the general liquidation of arms, he said. This step-by-step process was explained by the Soviet ambassador as founded on, for example, China's demand for a 50-percent reduction in U.S. and Soviet nuclear arms and on France's similar, but less specific stance before the countries can take part in the process. "We have taken the facts into account and are also inviting other countries, the neutral and nonaligned nations, for example, to take part," Israelyan said.

He strongly stressed the links between different types of weapons, particularly space and nuclear weapons, which according to Israelyan are two sides of the same coin. "There is no point in reducing nuclear arms without an agreement on space," the ambassador repeated several times during the press conference.

He also stressed the program's global character and said that on this point he thought it had been misinterpreted in the West. "It is not simply a question of nuclear arms, nor simply of space weapons and chemical weapons. We are also raising the questions of verification, confidence-building measures and, for example, the Vienna talks and the Stockholm conference," he declared.

The extension of its moratorium was not an easy decision for the Soviet Union. Its unilateral decision of August 1985 has already had repercussions since it is impossible to make progress in development without tests. And also, in 1985 SIPRI [Stockholm International Peace Research Institute] had already reported a clear difference in testing intensity between the United States and the Soviet Union -- 772 as against 556, the peace institute said.

"That is why we can only make progress if the United States does so," Israelyan said. He said that he is hopeful bearing in mind the reception the plan has received. No one has directly rejected the proposal.

When Israelyan raised the question of verification problems, to which the West has attached great importance, he said that the Soviet Union is just as interested in them as anyone else. Effectiveness is important here; if it can be secured, many different forms of control are possible. On the other hand, we do not really understand the need for on-the-spot inspection when we know and they know that all detonations can be registered at great distances. Israelyan also commented on the U.S. invitation to the Soviet Union to follow tests. "There is no great point in looking at these tests, when it is possible to register them. We want controls, but linked to disarmament, not controls for control's sake," the ambassador stressed.

During the press conference, Israelyan was asked questions about the degree of utopianism in the Soviet proposal, a suggestion which he rejected and repeated his view that the proposal is a whole --a read -- consisting of concrete steps that are balanced. The ambassador did not want to predict in which forum a breakthrough could be achieved, but he stressed that it could happen anywhere, provided the political will is present.

On the subject of the well-known linkage between space and nuclear weapons, Israelyan was asked about the absence of references to research into space weapons in the Soviet proposal. He drew a clear dividing line between basic research and applied research which he said was covered in the proposal by the use of the term "development."

He returned to the question of verification and said that it does not amount to a problem if the United States agrees to a test ban and/or linkage with disarmament.

Asked about possible Soviet readiness to include medium-range missiles deployed in the Asian part of the Soviet Union in the first stage of the plan, Israelyan's reply was unambiguous. "What we are offering against the background of what has happened in Europe is a first step here. If the threat to which we have responded with deployment in Asian is removed, we could of course link in this question too," he said.

This line of argument brought up the question of relations between China and the Soviet Union in a situation without nuclear arms. "The question is really serious and we are prepared to discuss it from an overall perspective. The whole of our program is about all types of weapons, not just about nuclear arms; the situation for different countries is of course different," Israelyan said.

On the question of the possibility of reaching targets in Europe with weapons deployed east of the Urals, Israelyan repeated that the Soviet proposal covers Europe as a territorial unit and that deployment in Asia are an Asian question and are linked to a different threat. He also made it clear that the so-called Paris proposal, that is, the proposal covering missiles in Europe, is still in force and that the two proposals by no means rule each other out.

Israelyan spoke in very hopeful terms about chemical weapons and said that he believes in realistic possibilities of liquidating them before the end of this decade.

Finally, when asked to assess U.S. tactics following the draft program, he seemed to expect above all a series of individual reactions in various forums, even though he thought it very possible that President Reagan will deliver a more general speech. Israelyan did not mention an alternative peace program as a likely possibility.

Success Depends on U.S.

LD281108 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union has offered the nations of the world a sweeping program, pointing out the path to fully ridding the earth of nuclear weapons, before the end of the century. The concrete proposals of the program, outlined in a statement by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev on 15th January are used as the basis for the Soviet stand at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments that have resumed in Geneva. What is the essence of these proposals? Details are from an eminent specialist in arms control, Professor Genrikh Trofimenko. Here is what he writes.

The new round of talks has begun in an atmosphere that is much more favorable for their success than the one that existed previously. The main factors that have changed the atmosphere for the better are the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev and the Soviet-American summit meeting in November last year in Geneva. At that meeting the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party and the President of the United States reached the conclusion that the work at the nuclear and space arms talks must be accelerated. When the leaders of countries agree on the need for such acceleration, this is not simply a declaration. This is a pledge by each side to its utmost to get out of the deadlock that has been reached and to seek mutually aceptable formulas. One may say this confidently. The Soviet approach to the problems on the agenda of these talks is based precisely on such a desire, and this is indicated by the Soviet proposals that have been laid at the negotiating table.

They deal primarily with a sharp reduction by one half of the Soviet and American nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory and retaining on remaining delivery vehicles no more than 6,000 warheads for each side. Mikhail Gorbachev's statement offers such a reduction as the first stage of this program for fully scrapping nuclear weapons, that is within 5 to 8 years. The Soviet Union also suggests that none of the three elements of the so-called strategic triad -- and the triad covers ballistic missiles sited on land, strategic bombers, and nuclear-capable submarines -- should carry more than 60 percent of the total of the nuclear warheads that the two countries will retain after the reduction. The Soviet Union is ready to take this step in order to meet Washington halfway in the spirit of goodwill.

America's leaders have repeatedly declared that the Soviet land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles carry a share of nuclear warhead out of proportion, as it were. The American side has agreed in principle to the idea of reducing offensive nuclear arms by 1/2. It now speaks of due application of the principle, in other words about what specific armaments are to be reduced. But on this point the stands of the two sides diverge rather significantly.

The United States insisted that its so-called forward-based nuclear delivery vehicles should not be included in this equation. However, the Soviet Union proved, justifiably so, that it is all the same for the Soviet people whether American nuclear missiles targeted on their country can be launched from, a submarine, a surface warship, an aircraft, or, say, from the territory of some particular country that is an American ally. Is a reasonable compromise possible in this case? Yes, it certainly is, given the desire. It is clear that acceptance of the Soviet proposal would mean a big contribution to progress at the Geneva talks.

Progress can be stimulated as greatly also by a positive solution in the spirit of the Soviet proposals on the issue of medium-range missiles. Europe is now literally crammed with nuclear weapons. The military confrontation there is particularly dangerous and so the Soviet Union believes that it is necessary to fully scrape all the medium-range Soviet and American ballistic and cruise missiles in the European zone. Already at the first stage of the program it offers to completely clear the earth of nuclear armaments.

I must also mention, writes Genrikh Trofimenko, another important problem which has a most direct bearing on success at the Geneva talks. It is common knowledge that the Soviet Union urges the United States to join the moratorium on any nuclear explosions it introduced last August and extended for another 3 months after 31st December. The American Administration now has additional time to weight the Soviet proposal and to respond positively.

Without a doubt, the people who are closely following the Geneva talks realize the great importance of this Soviet stand for success in nuclear disarmament. However, all the moves aimed at nuclear arms control would have been cancelled out unless the main thing had been solved: to prevent militarization of outer space.

It was agreed at the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan that the Geneva arms control talks would be based on the principle of solving the problems of nuclear and space armaments in their interrelationship.

Outer space must remain peaceful. No strike weapons should be deployed there and such weapons should not be developed either. This is the Soviet approach from the American side at the Geneva talks. The prospects of the talks depend on whether Washington displays such an approach and attainment of practical results in Geneva would fill with a weighty material content the Soviet program to fully eliminate nuclear weapons on our planet by the beginning of the next century.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

GORBACHEV'S PROPOSALS DISCUSSED DURING VISIT BY ITALY'S NATTA

Natta Meets With Gorbachev

LD281710 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, 28 Jan (TASS)--On 27 and 28 January Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, met with Alessandro Natta, general secretary of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), who is staying in Moscow at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

Gian Carlo Pajetta, a member of the leadership and the Secretariat of the PCI Central Committee, and Antonio Rubbi, a member of the PCI Central Committee, took part in the conversation which passed in a frank and cordial atmosphere.

During the conversation the sides had a wide-scale exchange of opinions on most important issues of the contemporary international situation which is positively influenced by the atmosphere of the Geneva summit meeting and those hopes for peace and disarmament which that meeting evoked the world over.

It was stressed that a large-scale complex of peace initiatives put forward in the January 15 statement of the general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU embraced all major areas and spheres of activity pertaining to arms reduction, disarmament and to consolidating prospects for a peaceful future and progress of all nations.

To deliver mankind from the threat of a nuclear war, to radically improve the international situation, to ensure reliable security to the peoples are the aims that should be worked for.

In this connection both sides stressed the need of exerting every effort to turn back the arms race, to prevent militarization of outer space, to get concrete results in having balanced and verified reduction of nuclear and conventional armaments. The freezing by both sides of the existing nuclear armaments and an end to nuclear tests would be of great significance as the first step in this direction.

It is necessary to work for attaining the balance of military forces in Europe on a lower level, without unilateral advantages, provided the guarantee of mutual security of the parties. The main aim here is termination of further deployment and phasing-out of the deployed nuclear systems on both sides and establishment in West and East European countries of zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons.

Gorbachev Addresses Dinner

LD281805 Moscow TASS in English 1747 GMT 28 Jan 86

["In Honor of Delegation of Italian Communist Party"--TASS headline]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 28 Jan (TASS)--The Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee gave a dinner today in honor of the General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party Alessandro Natta and comrades accompanying him. Present at the dinner were Mikhail Gorbachev, Geydar Aliyev, Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Andrey Gromyko, Yegor Ligachev, Mikhail Solomentsev, Viktor Chebrikov, Boris Ponomarev, other comrades.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Alessandro Natta exchanged speeches during the dinner.

Follows Mikhail Gorbachev's speech:

Dear Comrade Natta, Dear Comrades,

The CPSU has been guided by this in advancing a fortnight ago a concrete plan of the complete elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons within the next 15 years.

The new Soviet proposals already live an independent life of their own. They have become an object of scrutiny, analysis and comments of politicians and the press of all orientations, and of the broad public in actually all countries. In general, we are satisfied at how they were met in the world -- both by our friends and allies and those who bear the responsibility for the policy of imperialist powers. Of course, not all, but many people have already managed to see the core, the very substance of the Soviet plan -- a serious effort to approach international security problems closely, to concentrate attention on the main task, to take the bull by the horns, as they say here.

Of course, we never hoped and do not hope that the implementation of the proposals advanced by the Soviet Union will be an easy and simple job. There is no small number of opponents of disarmament, determined and stubborn opponents at that. These are primarily the forces of monopoly capital which get immense profits from the production of ever new types of weapons. These are the short-sighted politicians who would want, by whipping up the arms race, to turn it into a means for wearing out socialism economically, into a lever for applying military power pressure on those forces on the international scene which do not suit them, and by doing so, to ensure world dominance for themselves.

To put it short, these are the forces in the world of imperialism which, even when it comes to questions of war and peace, pursue their egoistic, self-serving aims, which make little of either the genuine national interests of their own countries or of the destinies of the human race.

There is one more real obstacle on the road toward radical disarmament. I refer to a certain inertia of thinking, its lag behind the world rapidly changing before our very eyes. Many habitual persuasions and traditionally held views that were possible correct thirty, twenty or even ten years ago are now hopelessly outdated. In a nuclear age the world, armed to its teeth and continuing to arm itself, is fraught with a possibility of an outbreak of nuclear war, even provided that no one wants it. Such a world is shaky, unstable. Unfortunately, this is not rhetorics. This is the reality which one has to reckon with.

This is how the CPSU assess the situation that has taken shape in the present-day world. This is what determines the orientation, the content and the meaning of the new Soviet initiatives. There is no need to repeat them. The more so, because the CPSU and the Italian Communist Party, as it seems to us, view these matters practically in an identical way. I would like to touch upon only two points.

First, The European aspect of the Soviet plan. From the point of view of the CPSU and the Soviet state, it is exceptionally important, both for Europe itself and for the entire world.

If we managed to eliminate the Soviet and American medium-range missiles on our continent without delaying or burdening the matter with other problems, we would unravel what is perhaps one of the complicated tangles in the present-day world politics and would significantly clear the way toward a radical reduction of nuclear weapons and then -- their complete elimination.

On that basis, it is possible -- and essential -- to further rapidly the construction of the edifice of European security, while developing, enriching and consolidating the process of detente in the spirit and on the basis of the Helsinki Final Act.

The split of the world of today is felt in Europe, probably, more painfully than anywhere else. But, we believe, it is precisely in this continent that there exists now every condition for overcoming the disconnection between the East and the West, particularly in matters of security and mutually advantageous cooperation. In a word, we hold that Europe is quite capable of meeting the challenge of the times.

The CPSU is prepared to take the most vigorous part in the quest for the essence and the forms of meeting this challenge. We hope that our proposals will be appraised by the left, democratic, anti-war forces of Europe as the contribution of the Soviet Communists to this important cause.

And second, a space aspect of the Soviet proposals, so to say. Certain persons assert that by its plan the USSR pursues one aim only, to undermine the "star wars" program and thus to get the upper hand of the United States and its President.

Let us make this matter clear. The Soviet Union regards the prevention of the transfer of the arms race to space as the main condition for saving humanity. And we have no intention to excel the United States in the unsavoury undertaking of the militarization of space. This is not the point of the matter at all.

I shall put it this say: We have no fear that we shall lag behind in the space race if it is imposed on us. There is no need to test our military and technological potentialities one more time. This might cost much too dearly not only to us and the United States but to entire humanity.

The Soviet Union is on principle strongly against the "star wars" project and not at all for the reason that it is an American one. We in Moscow view this matter as follows. It is impossible to create a universal space defence. This is, at best, an illusion -- from the technical, economic and political points of view. But any "space shield" can easily be turned into a "space sword" and the one who will hold it might be unable to resist the temptation to use it. This is the essence of the matter, and this is the source of our stand motivated by the interests of safeguarding peace and that alone.

Comrades, in our opinion, if we go by facts, the left-wing, democratic forces, of which the Communists have always been and remain an integral part, could act in a better organized way in the struggle against war menace. On some matters, including political ones, different trends of the left-wing forces have much wider areas on which they differ, than those on which they agree. This is true, but, the CPSU is convinced that these differences, no matter how profound they might seem, are much less important than the task, the striving to avert the threat of war.

I believe, what is needed is not to accumulate, not to cultivate the existing differences, but, taking them into consideration, to look for a common political denominator for interaction and cooperation on the cardinal problem of the present. But then, this refers not only to the European left-wing forces, but to the democratic, anti-war movement altogether, to all peace forces.

Our conversations with Comrade Natta naturally focussed on the role of the CPSU and the Italian Communist Party in the struggle against the nuclear threat and for peace and socialism, generally speaking, on the role of the Communists in today's world. That role is far from easy and very responsible. We are convinced that the problems, difficulties and differences on individual issues that exist in our movement can be overcome.

Natta Speaks at Dinner

LD282059 Moscow TASS in English 2039 GMT 28 Jan 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, 28 Jan (TASS)--After many years of acute tension, the recent Geneva summit meeting made it possible to restore the atmosphere of a constructive dialogue and set out the road of a concrete advance of the policy of disarmament. Detente and cooperation on a world scale, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party Alessandro Natta said at a dinner given in his honor and in the honor of comrades accompanying him by the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee. It is not simple to clear complex obstacles impeding the policy of detente. But there is no alternative to it and it is necessary to implement it resolutely for the destinies of civilization and entire humanity are at stake.

We have expressed more than once in the recent months and express now our high appraisal of the decisions adopted by the USSR to introduce a moratorium on nuclear testing, important proposals advanced by you, also in the recent days, to reduce strategic arms, to remove medium-range missiles from Europe, to ensure that mankind ushers in the new millennium being rid of the horror of nuclear holocaust.

Our party favours the policy of a balanced and controlled disarmament, Alessandro Natta said. We are pressing for real measures for disarmament to be adopted at the talks in Geneva, measures that would lead to a substantial reduction of all kinds of arms by both sides, specifically to the freezing of medium range missile launchers both in the west and the east of Europe for the purposes of their further complete dismantling. The setting up of zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons in NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries would be an important step in this direction.

We are aware of the need for the policy ensuring mutual security, said the general secretary of the Italian Communist Party. But in our opinion it can be resting increasingly on confidence and mutual understanding, on coexistence and cooperation, on a military balance brought to the lowest possible level with none of the sides striving for superiority. Precisely for this reason we can reject now with complete objectivity and firmness the attempts to spread the military rivalry into space. We declare against the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative of the United States since it would entail a new horrible arms race. Science can and must set itself nobler and more humane aims.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

ARGENTINE FOREIGN MINISTER'S VISIT REPORTED

Shevardnadze Speaks at Luncheon

LD291737 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1538 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, 29 (TASS)--The Soviet Union and Argentina can serve as a good example of the practical implementation of the policy of peaceful coexistence of states and equal and mutually beneficial cooperation in all spheres, founded on a respect for the interests, stances, and viewpoints of one another. This was stated by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign affairs minister. He gave a luncheon today in honor of Dante Mario Caputo, Argentine minister of foreign relations and worship.

Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that relations between the two countries have good prospects and there is a wide scope for the development of links and the deepening of cooperation in international affairs. He gave a lofty appraisal of the stance of Argentina as regards the new initiative of the Soviet Union, which was put forward in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on 15 January. "The program for completely freeing earth of nuclear weapons and preventing the militarization of space, the elimination of chemical weapons and other means of mass destruction, the realization of measures directed toward lessening the danger of war and consolidating peace has received support from the Argentine government. Such an attitude is expressed in the message of reply from R. Alfonsin to M.S. Gorbachev," Eduard Shevardnadze said.

Caputo Speech Reported

LD291745 Moscow TASS in English 1723 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, 29 Jan (TASS)--Peace is an indispensable, the most important condition for relations among states. With the existence of different social systems, the principle of peaceful coexistence is not only the cornerstone of diplomatic relations among states but also the only way for the globe's survival, said Argentina's Minister of Foreign Affairs Dante Mario Caputo speaking at a luncheon here today.

The luncheon was given in his honor by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Now that humanity is faced with the burning task of preserving peace on earth, when new horizons open in space, the attempts to turn the earth and outer space into a potential theatre of operations are regarded as extremely irresponsible by entire humanity, the Argentine minister said.

The minister said that the programme of complete disarmament by the year 2000 advanced by the USSR is the most important initiative advanced in this sphere so far.

Gromyko, Caputo Talk

LD291823 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, 29 Jan (TASS)--Some problems of the present-day international situation and questions of Soviet-Argentine relations were in the focus of attention of member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Religion of the Argentine Republic Dante Mario Caputo when they had a conversation in the Kremlin today.

Andrey Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union consistently continues the struggle for universal peace. The new historic initiatives set out in the statement of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev pursue a clear aim: to achieve the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere within the shortest period of time, only 15 years.

Our state has taken an important step towards disarmament, Andrey Gromyko said. The fundamental newness and significance of the Soviet programme of the complete elimination of nuclear arms is that it is concrete in content and in the schedules of its implementations.

It is important also that the Soviet Union has decided to extend for three months, that is till March 31, 1986 its earlier announced unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions. The ball is now in the U.S. court.

The Soviet Union stresses again that drastic reduction of nuclear arms is possible only when the USSR and the USA refuse to create, test and deploy of space strike arms.

Dante Mario Caputo pointed to a positive attitude of Argentina's government to the Soviet peace initiatives. And he stressed that the Soviet proposals of January 15, as an important political document, create a good foundation for practical solution of the questions of arms limitation and disarmament.

Bilateral Relations Discussed

LD291940 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received today at the Kremlin Dante Mario Caputo, minister of foreign relations and worship

of the Republic of Argentina, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union, and those accompanying him.

During their conversation there was an extensive discussion of some problems related to the present international situation and questions relating to Soviet-Argentine relations.

Comrade Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union is consistently continuing its struggle for universal peace. The new historic initiatives, set forth in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pursue a clear goal, that of achieving in a very short space of time, just 15 years, the total elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the entire globe.

The Soviet side stressed that the Soviet leadership highly appraises the efforts of Argentina, which together with other countries belonging to the group of six -- Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- have submitted constructive proposals to curtail the armaments race, to prevent the militarization of space, and to declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions. The Argentine minister was told that these ideas are in accord with the Soviet approach to a solution of these important problems.

The visitor's attention was drawn to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recent message to Argentine President Alfonsin. The message contained information about Soviet initiatives. Dante Caputo noted the Argentine Government's positive attitude toward the peaceful Soviet initiatives.

Press Conference Held

LD292013 Moscow TASS in English 1937 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, 29 Jan (TASS)--Speaking at a press conference at the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today, Dante Caputo, Argentina's minister of foreign affairs and religion, highly assessed the results of his talks in Moscow. "My meetings with Soviet leaders were held in an atmosphere of exceptional openness", the minister said. "A constructive dialogue between our countries took place. The talks covered both bilateral relations and international problems".

Answering questions from journalists, Dante Caputo said, specifically, that Argentina views the extension by the Soviet Union of the moratorium on all nuclear explosions till March 31, 1986 as a positive act of great importance. Dwelling on possible contribution of the countries, signatories to the Delhi declaration, to the achievement of arrangement between the great powers on the question of the complete elimination of nuclear arms, the minister said that meeting of representatives of those countries will shortly be held on that problem.

More on Meeting With Gromyko

PM311254 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talk With an Argentine Minister"]

[Excerpt] On 29 January A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received in the Kremlin Dante Mario Caputo, Argentine minister of foreign relations and worship, and the officials accompanying him, who are in the Soviet Union on an official visit. Some problems of the contemporary international situation and questions of Soviet-Argentine relations were discussed on a broad basis in the course of the talk.

A.A. Gromyko stressed that the Soviet Union is consistently continuing the struggle for universal peace. The new historic initiatives set out in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pursue a clear aim -- to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons on our planet in the shortest possible time, in just 15 years.

The Soviet Union has submitted its proposals when certain forces, particularly in NATO countries, are encouraging the development of negative, dangerous trends in policy. These forces are creating the threat of a new war for mankind and forcing the present generation to live in fear of mountains of nuclear weapons. The human race has no wish and no need to exist in this way any longer.

To turn the course of history toward detente -- such is the principled position of the Land of the Soviets. Its foreign policy activity -- before Geneva, at the Geneva Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, and after Geneva -- is geared toward this.

The specific Soviet program for nuclear disarmament by the end of the second millennium has found support among millions of people in the most diverse countries on all continents. Its implementation will make it possible to free peoples of the horrors and nightmares of nuclear insanity, prevent the arms race from spreading into space, and rechannel vast means into eliminating such problems as hunger, illiteracy, poverty, and disease.

Our state, A.A. Gromyko said, has taken an important step along the path to disarmament. The Soviet program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons is fundamentally new and significant in that it is specific in terms of content and time frames of implementation.

Also important in this respect is the Soviet decision to extend by 3 months -- that is, until 31 March 1986 -- its earlier declared unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions. It is now up to the U.S. side. The Soviet Union once again stresses that a radical reduction in nuclear weapons will be possible only when the Soviet Union and the United States renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space-based strike weapons.

The Soviet side stressed that the Soviet leadership highly appraises the efforts of Argentina, which, together with other countries in the "group of six" -- Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- has put forward constructive proposals relating to curtailing the arms race, preventing the militarization of space, and declaring a moratorium on nuclear explosions. The Argentine minister was told that these ideas are consonant with the Soviet approach in resolving these important problems.

The guest's attention was drawn to M.S. Gorbachev's recent message to Argentine President R. Alfonsin. The message contained information on the Soviet initiatives and stressed that it is essential to use every opportunity to establish a bilateral Soviet-U.S. moratorium followed by a complete and general ban on nuclear test explosions.

D. Caputo noted the positive attitude of the Argentine Government toward the Soviet peace initiatives. In this respect he stressed that, as an important political document, the Soviet proposals of 15 January form a good foundation for resolving in practice the questions of arms limitation and disarmament.

/9738
CSO: 2500/1255

USSR: NATO 'ATTEMPTS TO DISCREDIT' SOVIET INITIATIVES

LD291429 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 29 Jan 86

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] The NATO headquarters, as a DPA report from Brussels states, has published a report which asserts that the Soviet Union is stepping up military spending with the aim of creating the most up-to-date armaments systems. Here is a Mayak commentary; at the microphone is Viktor Levin.

As one can tell from this report, the NATO headquarters report makes no mention of the Soviet peaceful proposals set forth in the statement by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. However, in essence the report manifestly constitutes an attempt to cast a shadow over the Soviet initiatives and to justify a continuation of the militaristic policy. It is known that the NATO leaders are persistently striving to get all members of the bloc to systematically increase military allocations by a minimum of 3 percent a year. These demands not only do not give rise to enthusiasm in a whole number of West European countries, but are met with open resistance. Thus the bosses of the bloc are trying to twist their partners' arms. In order to make their demands seem well-founded, they refer to patently falsified data on the USSR's budget.

The NATO report repeats an old thesis. But, under present conditions, it also contains an absolutely definite concealed meaning: precisely, it attempts to discredit Soviet initiatives. Even the greatest hotheads in NATO cannot bring themselves to do this directly. The Soviet proposals are too outstanding [yarkii] but an attack on them is waged by degrees. By what methods? By the same methods which have long been part of the arsenal of NATO propagandist means, by juggling, falsification, through calculations that far from all people in the West have the possibility of getting an idea of the Soviet leader's statement from the primary source. After all, this document answers directly to current NATO thoughts.

There it is written in black and white that together with the removal of mass annihilation weapons from states' arsenals the Soviet Union proposes that conventional armaments and armed forces should also be a subject of agreed reductions. Especially singled out is the question of a ban on the creation of non-nuclear armaments based on new physical principles -- that is, in particular beam weapons, radiowave and genetic weapons. That is the very latest things which NATO is trying to rebuke us for intending to create.

It is of course naive to expect that the NATO headquarters should approve the Soviet initiatives. However, the facts should not be distorted so brazenly.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

USSR: GORBACHEV STATEMENT PROVIDES ALTERNATIVE TO ARMS

PM051029 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 Jan 86 p 14

[Own political observer Fedor Burlatskiy article: "Great Dream and Realistic Plan"]

[Text] It is 2 weeks since M.S. Gorbachev's statement was published. The stream of responses to it is not only failing to die down, but is increasing. After statements by the leaders of various states, the press, radio, and TV in essentially all countries have joined the discussion of our proposals.

My attention was drawn by a phrase in a commentary. It said this: M.S. Gorbachev's dream. This assessment is addressed to the idea of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. And the assessment is expressed with some sympathy, but with a certain doubt about the reality of the task. It is too good to be true, apparently. A mere trifle to eliminate all nuclear arsenals numbering 55,000 warheads belonging to the five great powers -- the United States, the USSR, Britain, France, and China. A mere trifle to coordinate the positions of all these powers and take the security interests of each of them into account.

Many other commentaries which use the word "dream" one way or another feature the theme that our hopes of entirely destroying such monstrous weapons, at least in the foreseeable future, are unrealistic. Certain elements, as a rule, are picked out from the statement mainly concerning the current talks in Geneva on halving the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territories, on the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone, and on the elimination of chemical weapons. Of course, completing these tasks alone would be of immense importance. But why is the central idea -- the idea of completely eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide -- somehow pushed aside?

However complex this task may be, however difficult it may be to coordinate the positions of the Soviet Union, the United States, and the other nuclear powers, we must all know where we are going and what our ultimate goals are. This approach will also help to coordinate phased, transitional resolutions.

Moreoever, I heard the word "dream" in this context -- the context of the struggle against the nuclear threat -- back in Geneva when I was there during the summit between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan. A U.S. journalist reported that President Reagan talked about his dream during the famous fireside chats between the two leaders of our powers. And indeed, in one of his first speeches after the summit, President Reagan talked about this chat: "I set forth our Strategic Defense Initiative -- our research program envisaging the possibility of creating [sozdaniye] defensive systems which could ultimately protect all states from the threat of nuclear war...People would finally stop being scared of each other. That is my dream."

Thus, the leader of the United States, which was the first to create the atomic bomb and start the nuclear arms race, now dreams of saving his country and, so he says, other countries from fearing nuclear destruction. In what way? By creating [sozdaniye] even more fantastic weapons.

Is this a new idea? Is it perhaps an original invention specifically for nuclear strategy, which ordinary human minds are incapable of grasping? Not at all. In the second half of the 19th century A. Nobel invented dynamite; this is what he stated in this connection: "Perhaps my plants will put a stop to war faster than your congresses. The day that two major army formations can destroy each other in an instant, all civilized nations will be horrified and demobilize their armies." The Franco-Prussian war happened soon after and World War I followed 43 years later.

In Geneva, it was reasonably put to the President that, "we are told about the desire to remove fear of missiles and eliminate nuclear weapons entirely. That desire can only be welcomed, it fully accords with the goals of our policy. But it is much simpler to eliminate these arms without creating [sozdavat] space strike systems for that purpose. Why spend tens of hundreds of billions of dollars and pile up mountains of space arms alongside the mountains of nuclear arms? Where is the sense in it?"

Now the entire world, all nuclear and non-nuclear states, and all international public opinion has been presented with the Soviet plan for ridding the earth of nuclear weapons by the end of this century. The plan is specific, well-balanced, and business-like; it clearly defines our proposals at each stage of the entire nuclear disarmament process. This, I am convinced, is where the true dream of each sober-minded person on earth is realized.

Yes, representatives of our generation have dreamed of this from the outset, from the moment that the first atomic bombs were dropped. The instantaneous destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the turning of 200,000 people -- burned in an unthinkable hellfire of 10 million degrees -- into cosmic dust shook our imagination. The atomic bomb, carrying the threat of death for hundreds of thousands of people, and much more so the thermonuclear potential of the 55,000 bombs held on earth require a radical change in human thinking.

Of course, we are not simpletons. That has rightly been said. Our partners must firmly learn to do as they would be done by. Nobody will succeed in wrecking the party that has been gained at the cost of immensely strenuous efforts and privations.

But why all these military games? Why brandish in front of each other all the latest inventions of a monstrous imagination which our forefathers could only have dreamed of in a nightmare? Everyone is already sufficiently convinced that outplaying each other is impossible, using these toys is impossible, and scaring the other side with them is impossible. What remains? To end the game, to end military rivalry, and to destroy nuclear weapons. To destroy them forever. Let scientists and engineers in all countries invent rockets for joint flights to Mars and point mankind toward the stars rather than toward "star wars."

Yes, mankind must acquire a new way of thinking if it does not want to vanish forever from the face of our planet and, probably, from the entire universe which, perhaps, created us for the great goal of self-knowledge and development.

Back in my childhood I -- like, probably, many people of my generation -- hated the atomic bomb. It was not even the sense of fear that President Reagan talks about, because it is absurd to fear instant disappearance. No, we hate the bomb as something monstrous and fantastic beyond the bounds of human consciousness and human relations. Saying that nuclear weapons are inhuman is to say virtually nothing.

Even the pictures of hell painted by the genius Michelangelo in the Vatican's Sistine Chapel -- and they have always been considered the ultimate in human suffering -- even those pictures are just a child's game compared with nuclear reality.

Yes, this is the dream of our generation which recalls a time when there was no atomic bomb. A dream of returning to the past, where there was no place for these monstrous weapons. I am very much afraid that succeeding generations born in the period of the bomb's existence will no longer be able to believe that man is capable of destroying it.

The main argument I heard from my Western colleagues was that technical progress is inexorable and man must come to terms with the sword of Damocles which will constantly hang over his head. That, they said, is the logic of history and the will of providence itself. Nothing can be done about it. The dream of destroying nuclear weapons thus remains a dream. The only thing that can be done is to create [sozdavat] a shield against nuclear missile weapons. Of course, subsequent generations will again create some kind of weapons which may be able to break through or bypass this shield. And so on until the end of time. Similar opinions from skeptics, disbelievers, and "realists," not to mention people who cannot give up the illusion of might engendered by nuclear weapons, have been voiced in the West in response to M.S. Gorbachev's plan.

The proposals to completely eliminate nuclear weapons are currently being presented in the West as unfeasible. Are they a dream? Yes they are, if you like, but only in the sense in which Herbert Wells, the well-known science fiction writer, spoke of Lenin's dream of creating a new society on the ruins of a hemorrhaging Russia. You remember, of course, that Wells called Lenin the "dreamer in the Kremlin." It is now obvious how important dreams are when they pose noble goals and accord with people's aspirations. This sort of dream melds with reality and serves as a reliable bridge into the future.

Maybe our partners in the Western countries do not agree with all elements of the proposed plan. Maybe the tasks of the first stage of disarmament will be completed first. That would already be a major victory on the road toward the ultimate goal. But they should also think once again about what the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of arms is leading to.

TIME magazine featured an article entitled "A Farewell to Arms" -- you will remember, of course, that this was the title of E. Hemingway's famous novel. The article states: "The Soviet Union has called for the complete elimination of nuclear missiles, warheads, bombs, and other weapons on our planet. But this was not presented as a vague future aim: The Soviet leader formulated quite a detailed three-stage plan to be implemented by the end of this century." Moreover, after this positive assessment the writer of the article tries to dispute many specific elements in our plan, alleging that it ignores the difficult choice which must repeatedly be made in the process of implementing it in order to maintain an unstable equality in nuclear forces.

But this is wrong. The Soviet proposals precisely stipulate the maintenance of the principle of equality of forces with a simultaneous phased reduction in their levels. Furthermore, let the West formulate its own alternative, taking into account our proposals, its own concrete plan for disarmament and present it in place of the plans for a new phase in the arms race, including the creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons.

We understand perfectly the need to coordinate our plan with the other nuclear powers' proposals. But let us travel precisely this road and agree straightaway on our ultimate goals. We could just agree on the goal of the talks currently under way in Geneva or on ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in space.

Now it is necessary to take the next and, perhaps, even more important step -- to agree on our ultimate goals, on the need for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. All the more so as this has been discussed in general terms both by President Reagan and other Western leaders.

It must be said that many specialists in these countries properly understand the dilemma. Here is what THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote: "Last week's Soviet initiative again makes us realize the Soviet Union's new dynamism. Of course, the USSR has called for total disarmament before. This time Moscow has given new force to the idea, outlining specific time frames, which evidently marks a serious approach to this most important problem of the day. The Russians have hereby challenged the main argument on which Reagan bases his 'Strategic Defense Initiative,' claiming that a strong space shield is the best way to avoid the threat of nuclear war."

Nonetheless, most Western -- and particularly U.S. -- press commentators continue to defend the need to retain nuclear weapons. P. Geyelin, a U.S. specialist on these problems, writes: "To pretend that the world can ever be entirely rid of the threat of nuclear arms is to belittle the importance of the debates on arms control. After all, the hope is thereby created that there actually is an alternative to the nuclear potential for deterrence. But the unavoidable truth is that there is no alternative."

There is an alternative! And it is now being proposed by a power which, having a mighty nuclear potential, is striving for the great goal of entirely removing nuclear weapons from people's lives. Conventional, non-nuclear arms and civilized relations among states can completely fulfill the function of mutual deterrence.

A new, fresh approach to the problem of peace policy is needed. This approach was stated just before and particularly during the Geneva summit between the Soviet and U.S. leaders. This approach lies at the very basis of M.S. Gorbachev's recent statement on disarmament questions. The problem of survival as the main problem of the nuclear era demands new thinking on the part of all people around the world.

Human thought is not always able to grasp changes on an historic scale. This shortcoming is particularly dangerous now that the threat of nuclear annihilation has reached each home and each family.

Yes, mankind needs civilized relations more than ever in order to achieve the key task of our time -- the elimination of the threat of thermonuclear war. The way out is to learn the art of living together, to develop friendly relations among states and peoples, to organize mutually advantageous cooperation, and through joint efforts to shape a new model and a new type of international relations befitting our nuclear age.

Soviet people probably realized this before anyone else, because we know and remember what war is. We do not simply know this, but feel it with our entire being and our entire wounded soul, since there is not a single family among us in which a loved one -- father, mother, brother, or daughter -- has not been killed.

This must be understood and cannot fail to be understood by Americans and all other people. Then the plan announced by our country for the total elimination of nuclear weapons and gradual phased disarmament will turn into joint solutions on the part of the entire world community in the interests of security and the prosperity of all the earth's peoples.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

SOVIET, U.S. DISARMAMENT POLICIES CONTRASTED BY TASS OBSERVER

LD301727 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 30 Jan 86

["Themes of the Day" program; commentary by TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov -- "Into the 3d Millennium Without Nuclear Weapons"]

[Excerpts] The situation in the world must raise serious concern. Mankind today faces the necessity of getting over the negative tendencies which have accumulated in the course of the last few years, of removing the obstructions created by the aggressive circles of imperialism in the way of bridling the arms race, and of eliminating the impending nuclear threat over the planet. People are waiting for and justly demanding a fundamental improvement in the international situation.

Being aware of its responsiblity to mankind, the Soviet Union has set forth new, far-reaching initiatives in the field of disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, which are aimed at ensuring a resolute move toward detente and a normalization of the international situation.

International responses to the Soviet proposals fill millions of pages in newspapers and magazines and thousands of kilometers of teletype paper. Of course, these responses are not all the same; they depend on what circles, what forces are behind this or that mass media organ. But if the essence, the main point is singled out from the stream of responses, there is every reason for saying: The statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is assessed worldwide as an epoch-making document in the consistent fight of our country for maintaining and consolidating peace and for concluding the 20th century under the badge of peace and nuclear disarmament, which would correspond to the basic interests and hopes of all peoples on the planet. This is really the way it is.

The nucleus, the pivot of the large-scale complex of our proposals -- which have provoked and are continuing to provoke an extremely wide positive response on all continents -- is the program for the full elimination of nuclear arms over a 15-year period.

What is it that constitutes the fundamental novelty and significance of this program? It is, first and foremost, the fact that -- unlike the wishes expressed from time to time of official figures of Western states, which may be good, but are often aimed only at misleading public opinion -- this program is realistic and absolutely definite both as to its procedure and the time limits for its implementation. Working out specific accords on the initial scope and the time limits for the reduction and elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass attack should, in the opinion of the Soviet Union, become the main, the central point of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit.

It should be noted in particular that the Soviet program has been drawn up with provisions for maintaining the present balance of forces in the world, but at a lower and lower level in every stage of its implementation. Thus, during the implementation of the program no threat to anybody's security will be created at any time.

How then has this initiative been met in official Washington? This question is all the more important, all the more logical because although the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev goes far beyond the current stage of Soviet-U.S. contacts and talks, being addressed to all states and all governments, it is quite obvious that the practical implementation of the idea of a nuclear-free world depends, especially in the initial stages, on the attainment, first and foremost, of a mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is these two countries, which possess the largest arsenals of nuclear weapons, which must provide the example of radically reducing them.

The concept expounded by the United States is well known according to which it is supposed to be possible to eliminate nuclear weapons by creating qualitatively new weapons and stationing them in space. It is obvious that to build a policy on such a calculation means to commit an irreparable mistake; after all, the history of the arms race has convincingly proved that no new weapon lessens the danger for mankind, but on the contrary, it reinforces it. Should weapons emerge in space, the arms race would not only not be stopped, it would develop with unprecedented strength and in the most dangerous directions. Let us repeat, this is obvious. Nevertheless, in certain U.S. quarters they not only continue to push this militaristic concept, but state for all to hear that the plans for "star wars" preparations will continue to be implemented. Following Pentagon chief Weinberger, this has just been reaffirmed in an interview for U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz as well.

We have already said that, guided by the desire to do everything possible for implementing the nuclear disarmament program, our country, displaying goodwill, has extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions for 3 months, urging the United States to follow this example. What then is Washington's response? Unfortunately, it is unambiguous. Relying on invented, false postulates about a need to overcome an imaginary lag behind the Soviet Union and on absolutely groundless references to difficulties in implementing checks of nuclear weapons tests, Washington refuses to reciprocate the Soviet initiative.

It is fitting to recall that last year the United States staged 16 underground nuclear tests, including seven after the Soviet Union had declared its unilateral moratorium. The development [obrabotka] and commissioning of more and more models of nuclear weapons, as is clear from Weinberger's statements in particular, will continue. Why? What is the aim? Why are nuclear experiments being carried out in the United States which, as is clear, nurture distrust and mutual suspicion? One can find an answer to these questions in the recent statement by Markey, for example, a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. I am convinced that the main reason the White House refuses to join the nuclear test moratorium is the White House's desire to accelerate work on the main thrust of the "star wars" program, envisioning the creation of nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers, this U.S. legislator said. "Star wars", he stressed, is not only an obstacle to progress at the strategic weapons limitation talks, they are also an obstacle to talks on the complete and universal banning of nuclear tests. This is correct.

The facts show that the architects of U.S. foreign policy, although they are not sparing in statements of their own love of peace, certainly do not intend to slacken

the pace in the implementation of the U.S. rearmament program, which is worked out for years ahead. This was acknowledged recently by the U.S. President as well: Speaking in the White House to representatives of a big business lobby, he observed that the draft federal budget for fiscal 1987, to be submitted to Congress in the next few days, will provide for a growth in military expenditure despite the fact that in the current fiscal year U.S. military allocations have been brought up to almost $300 billion, a record sum in the country's history. Despite this, the administration intends to increase these sums in fiscal 1987 by a minimum of another 3 percent.

Apart from all else, the immense international importance of the Soviet initiatives is that they again demonstrate with immense, gigantic force and cogency, the profound love of peace in the country of the Soviets. They make it possible to throw an even clearer light on the question of who is what in today's world; who really comes out for the peace and security of people and who, while sounding off about peace, would like to take things in the opposite direction.

There is no need to say which forces and which quarters in the United States have an interest in the preservation and even growth of tension in the world and in material preparations for war continuing at an ever faster peace. Suffice it to recall that over the last 5 years, the total profits just of the ten biggest U.S. military-industrial corporations that are implementing the U.S. rearmament programs have increased by 150 percent and that preparations for "star wars" makes it possible for the arms kings, the big bosses of the military-industrial complex, to increase these profits in a geometric progression. I think it is important to speak clearly and precisely, again and again, of the following: Those who are refusing to adopt specific measures aimed at ensuring a peaceful life for the whole of mankind and are launching fresh military adventures and reinforcing the arms race, are throwing down a challenge to the UN decision to stage an international peace year and are taking a heavy responsibility upon themselves before mankind. It is not only in our country, but throughout the world that people expect not words, but deeds of the United States; they expect a constructive stand at the talks on nuclear and space weapons.

As far as the Soviet people are concerned, and this is once again reaffirmed quite forcefully by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement, they are devoted to peace as the highest value, equal to the gift of life. Our country is quite determined to continue to do everything in its power to prevent war, to eliminate the deficit of trust which exists, and to halt the nuclear slide and keep the sky over the globe clear.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

U.S. ATTITUDE TO ARMS PACKAGE EXAMINED

PM301919 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Mikhail Ozerov article under the rubric "Journalist's Notes": "Reason Against Force: Into the 21st Century Without Weapons!"]

[Excerpt] It is common knowledge that for many years Washington was unwilling to learn what seemed an elementary truth: survival in our nuclear age is only possible on one condition -- that we are able to understand each other.

However, latter-day imitators of Herostrates have tried with might and main to militarize thought. What success books, movies, and television programs showing battles against Russians are enjoying across the ocean! The screens are full of "star wars." Children play computer battles (also against the Russians, of course!)

But perhaps reason has somehow begun to stir on the banks of the Potomac? This was people's hopeful thought during the Geneva meeting and they have still not lost that hope. At that time all attention was focused on the U.S. President's words about a "new start" in relations with the Soviet Union. How often R. Reagan assured us then that his administration is not seeking superiority over Russia and does not want war!

Fine words. But they are just words. Where are the deeds?

Unfortunately there are no deeds to be seen. We have been proposing very significant actions to strengthen security. What is more, we have been carrying them out unilaterally. The "other side," however, usually remains completely silent. Even worse than that: It tries to exploit our love of peace. For instance, we renounced nuclear explosions and have now extended our moratorium by another 3 months. In reply some people in the United States are cynically demanding: Let us conduct our nuclear tests more actively, now that an opportunity has appeared "to get ahead of Russia"!

The statement said clearly and definitely that this is Stone Age thinking. Then -- in the Stone Age -- the main concern was to arm oneself with a bigger club or a heavier rock. Now the concern is with weapons, primarily in space.

The U.S. President seemed to welcome the package of Soviet peace initiatives. However, neither he nor his entourage mentions the main obstacle on the path to disarmament -- the "star wars" program. The transoceanic leaders cannot abandon their sinister brainchild! However, we are proposing going into the third millennium not with programs for battles in the sky, but with large-scale plans for the peaceful exploration of space using the forces of all the peoples.

These are two diametrically opposed approaches. Even the Western press, including the press across the ocean, is forced to praise our stance. For example, THE NEW YORK TIMES, noting the "Soviet Union's new dynamism," writes that "Moscow's ideas signify a serious approach to the disarmement problem and the Russians have thereby issued a serious challenge to the main argument on which Reagan bases his 'Strategic Defense Initiative"--the claim that a reliable space shield is the best way to abolish the threat of nuclear war."

Will U.S. statesmen cast off the shackles of the old way of thinking? Our planet's future depends to a large extent on this question. The U.S. Administration seems to be showing some elements of realism, but further progress is needed.

At the moment the U.S. side of the scales bears heavy "weights" which do not inspire optimism: pyramids of arms, sabotage, provocation, the refusal to consider the will of sovereign peoples, egoistical imperial schemes... In all, a reliance on strength.

But many centuries ago, Shota Rustaveli wrote:
People, do not take pride in strength.
Throw away your stupid toy!
For a small spark is enough
To burn down a great forest.

Some people across the ocean would do well to heed the great poet's wise call!

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

TASS: NATO'S GEN ROGERS OPPOSED TO GORBACHEV INITIATIVE

LD011449 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1115 GMT 1 Feb 86

[Text] New York, 1 Feb (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Setunskiy reports:

The response of NATO to the Soviet program to rid the world of nuclear weapons is an accelerated build-up of the latest versions of such weapons. This was stated in all candor in an interview with AP by the U.S. General Bernard Rogers, the commander of NATO's joint armed forces in Europe. He announced plans to begin the siting in Western Europe of new, "more efficient" tactical nuclear missiles after 1988. This, the general stressed, would be part of the extensive program of "modernization" of NATO's nuclear arsenals planned for the period 1988-1995.

Rogers explained that "modernization" provides for the replacement of "obsolete" nuclear missiles that are currently deployed in central Europe with new, more accurat ones with a longer range. He also came forward with an "initiative" to develop [razrabotka] and produce new nuclear missiles of the "air-to-surface" class, with the aim of equipping NATO air forces.

Touching on the Soviet program for the elimiantion of all nuclear armaments, the NATO commander asserted, as if to ridicule common sense, that it was "potentially dangerous" to Western Europe.

In particular, he called on the Washington administration not to agree under any circumstances to the Soviet proposal for the complete elimination, in the first stage, of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles. This would "weaken the United State's strategic nuclear umbrella," he said frankly. But what horrifies the NATO military commander more than anything is the prospect that the world might be totally rid of nuclear weapons, and with them the threat of nuclear destruction. In this case, he said, trying to intimidate the Western Europeans, the USSR world supposedly have the advantage in conventional weapons. "We must retain nuclear weapons," he declared, as if issuing an ultimatum.

Rogers acknowledges that the course of the Pentagon and NATO high command toward pressing ahead with nuclear rearmament may "encounter difficulties," that is, with the further growth of the antinuclear, antiwar movement in Western Europe and the protests of the broad public in those countries which the U.S. Administration has accorded the role of nuclear hostages. He reported that next week the NATO top brass will set off for the capitals of Western Europe to push through its militarist plans.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

USSR'S GROMYKO RECEIVES VANCE, DISCUSSES RELATIONS, PROPOSALS

Proposals 'Impress' Vance

LD031732 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 3 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 3 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, today received in the Kremlin Cyrus Vance, a noted American public figure and politician, a former U.S. secretary of state. Vance is paying a visit to the Soviet Union in connection with the sittings of the working group on Soviet-American relations of the Dartmouth Conference.

Exchanging opinions, the sides touched upon various aspects of the present-day international situation and Soviet-American relations.

Andrey Gromyko drew the visitor's attention to the Soviet programme for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons, formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement of January 15. If the USA agrees to the Soviet proposals, their implementation could rid mankind forever of the nuclear threat, to prevent the spread of the arms race into outer space and to strengthen trust among countries and peoples.

It was stressed by the Soviet side that the ending of nuclear weapons tests could become the first and efficient step towards restricting the arms race. The Soviet Union halted testing unilaterally way back last August and appealed to the USA and the other nuclear powers to follow its example. At the outset of this year the Soviet state, again unilaterally, extended its moratorium till March 31. People all over the world are expecting the USA to give a positive response to the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union. Nuclear testing must be resolutely prohibited from the point of view of both the security of the peoples and human morality.

The USSR Supreme Soviet supported the latest peace initiatives and explained them in an address to the U.S. Congress, Vance was told. It is necessary to do everything possible to achieve substantial and effective decisions leading to the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons, and parliaments can contribute to the formulation of such decisions. Their words carry much weight in foreign politics as well. The international public, including the Dartmouth Conference, which continues constructively to contribute to a discussion of international politics, is playing a positive role in promoting practical results on the problem of preventing an arms race in outer space, terminating it on Earth, and of the reduction and eventual complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

This means that if we speak of prospects for the development of mankind the common political denominator for actions of all countries on the international scene -- and this is a firmly held opinion of the Soviet leadership -- should be disarmament, and above all, nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet program for the elimination of nuclear weapons given the ban on space strike arms fully accords with these lofty goals with the subject of the current Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva and the results of the Geneva summit meeting between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

The Soviet peace initiatives, Andrey Gromyko stressed, have been met with approval by the governments of many countries and by broad masses. They strike the imagination both with their determination and scale. A positive reaction abroad, including from famous statesmen in western countries, testifies that these initiatives should be reckoned with.

The nations of the world expect the American leadership to show political will along the lines of constructive cooperation on these problems of paramount importance. The administration in Washington has more than once declared its allegiance to the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons. And now the Soviet Union gives it a chance to engage in that process in actual fact, not merely in words. We live in an age when the leaders of states, should, must take decisions that would prevent a nuclear holocaust.

Both sides expressed the conviction that the negotiations on the limitation and elimination of nuclear arms, and on the prevention of the spread of the arms race to outer space could be a success if both powers -- the U.S.S.R. and the United States -- worked consistently toward the said goal. This is confirmed by the experience that was accumulated by the Soviet Union and the United States of America in the course of previous negotiations which ended in the conclusion of relevant agreements between the two.

Cyrus Vance spoke with appreciation of the new Soviet peace initiative and noted that it had impressed him favorably. He came out in favor of an early search for accords along the road to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and said that from his point of view the U.S. Administration should come up with a detailed point-by-point reply with a view to opening concrete and business-like negotiations.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of the U.S.A. and Canada under the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., took part in the conversation.

Proposals 'Center of Conversation'

LD041951 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] Foreign news agencies are giving broad coverage to Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko's conversation with Cyrus Vance, former U.S. secretary of state. Here is a latest news commentary. At the microphone is Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer:

At the center of the conversation in the Kremlin were the USSR's large-scale peace proposals that were advanced in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement. The U.S. politician positively appraised the new Soviet initiative, noting that it had produced a favorable impression in his country. Indeed, I would just like to point out that 207 congressmen have already supported the draft resolution of the U.S. House of Representatives calling for supporting the Soviet proposal for a complete nuclear test ban.

But what has been the reaction of the Washington administration? At a regular press conference, a White House spokesman stated that the administration is still in the process of working out its response. Has not this "process" gone on long enough? After all, in other circumstances official Washington acts far quicker. Let us take, for example, the events following the Challenger disaster. A presidential commission has just started to investigate the causes of the explosion of the spacecraft, and more and more versions are being put forward about it, including the unreliability of the U.S. booster rockets. But in the Pentagon they are giving the impression that nothing particular has happened, and they are talking about the need to continue, and even to push on further with the United States' military space program.

Incidentally, it is not just the military that is now behaving in this manner, but also the United States' political leaders. Take for example, the recent speech by Vice President Bush, who, in setting out the Republican Party's platform for the autumn midterm elections to Congress, placed at its center a program for the further build-up of armaments, including strike and space weapons. Judging from what has been published in the U.S. press, this program will, from the financial point of view, be sealed in the draft budget for next year, which the White House has sent to Congress.

This is, indeed, dangerously playing with fire. Since the Challenger disaster, many U.S. newspapers have been asking one and the same question: What would happen if a similar disaster should occur during preparation for "star wars?" Would it not completely wipe out human civilization?

During the conversation in the Kremlin with the U.S. politician, it was noted that we are living in an age when leaders of states must -- are obliged to -- make decisions that would prevent a nuclear disaster. Let us hope that Washington heeds the voices of wisdom.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

USSR'S 'TOP PRIORITY' PROGRAM ON 'WILLINGNESS' IN ARMS CONTROL

LD031659 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 3 Feb 86

[From the "Top Priority" program, presented by Vladimir Posner with Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Excerpts] [Posner] Hello, everybody and welcome to "Top Priority". Today on the panel, as usual, are Dr Radomir Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov of the USA and Canada Studies Institute and your host is Vladimir Posner. Today we'll be discussing equal responsibility and we'll be discussing it as applying to the arms race. Now you've certainly heard it said that both the United States and the Soviet Union are equally responsible for the arms race and for where we are today. That view, which is shared by many people with just plain common sense, is expressed also in the words of William Shakespeare: "A plague on both your houses". I propose we examine this particular area and we examine it first of all, perhaps, from the viewpoint of the willingness of this or that country to actually disarm, to find ways of controlling and reducing nuclear weapons. I believe it can be said that the latest proposals by the Soviet Union as formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev, mapping out a three-stage plan to do away with nuclear weapons by the year 2000, does express this willingness on the Soviet Union's part. However, let's get down to brass tacks. How do you feel about this whole issue and the issue of willingness, Dr Bogdanov?

[Bogdanov] Well, willingness, to my mind, belongs to rather subjective, you know, things of life, not objective. Whether it is the will or not to, willingness by itself doesn't mean too much if it does not lead to practical deeds, you know. We have witnessed many times in the history that some very benign goals were stated very loudly, but we never completed them, we never realized them, you know. So I prefer while talking about willingness to link it with the practical deeds. But you know, though our topic is rather of historical nature, I believe it has very close links with the realities of today. And when I come back to Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal on getting rid of nuclear arms it comes to my mind how all that began, how all that begins. When? I wouldn't put this, you know, banal question, who is guilty, who is responsible, but still, you know, to understand deeper what our proposals mean, I would like to dwell a little bit on this (?past), to come back a little bit to the history of that question. Maybe that will justify our talking about what you have suggested. Let me start with some figures. I have very few words today, but just some figures and some facts which I would like to bring to the notice of our American listeners. Number one, we finished the Second World War with terrible human (?loss) -- 20 million people. Number two, we were literally stricken, half of our country, literally speaking, was destroyed by German occupation. What does it mean? That 15 major cities of the Soviet Union were destroyed.

[Posner] Fifty?

[Bogdanov] Fifteen, fifteen major -- I don't count small, I mean major. Number three, several thousands of villages, big and small, were destroyed and material losses come to the level of several billion of dollars, not today's dollars, mind you, but those dollars.

[Posner] 1945.

[Bogdanov] [words indistinct] 1934. So my question is, the leading countries still [words indistinct] how we could [words indistinct] towards the other countries or towards America which finished the war -- that was the only country with real economic and financial...changes thought all the others [words indistinct].

And another fact which I would like to bring to the notice of my American listeners is that we and [word indistinct] armed forces as big as 12, about 12 million people and after '45, we had several major cuts in our armed forces, in such a way that by the end -- by the beginning of '48 -- from 12 million we came to about 2.8 million people in our armed forces. That is the fact which is abolutely distorted in America because people still believe that beginning from the end of the Second World War we kept the same armed forces that we had fighting the Germans, you know. Now that's introduction to the program.

[Posner] Well, that's a very impressive introduction. Let me just recapitulate. You are saying then that between 1945, the end of World War Two, and 1948, Soviet...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] The beginning of '48.

[Posner] ...the beginning of '48, the Soviet military force was cut from 12 million to somewhat under 3 million people?

[Bogdanov] They are official figures and if somebody is really interested they can pick up, you know, that from our press, from our official statements. So my point is, my question to my American listeners is, how a country in such a situation could be aggressive and could have aggressive, you know, designs? Now, the nuclear problem -- which is the major problem of our day -- who started all that? Just to remind to my American listeners that the first bomb was exploded, nuclear bomb, in August '45, American. Ours was exploded at the end of forties, at the end of forties.

Now, strategic bombers -- and you know I am going item by item in their historical consequence -- strategic bombers, American strategic bomber, first one appeared in the middle of the fifties, in the middle fifties, ours at the end of the fifties. And let me remind you that a kind of bomber gap, so-called bomber gap, was created by Truman administration just to produce a big jump in the American production of nuclear or strategic bombers. And they were accusing us that we had already so many of them that America should catch up with us. After that they themselves (?punched) up astonishing figures that the so-called bomber gap never existed and the number of Soviet gaps [as heard] was distorted, exaggerated three, four time, three, four times, that's American official figures published.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov, this business of gaps is not new. I mean, it was used consistently over the years: the bomber gap, the missile gap, the this gap and the that. That's true enough. I would like to ask you to hold on for one minute there. Dr Plekhanov has been strangely silent today. We'll get back to Dr Bogdanov's very interesting figures shortly, but we'd like to have your view.

[Plekhanov] Well, I support what Dr Bogdanov just said. I think one should also keep in mind how the world looked to American policymakers at the end of the Second World War.

Europe lay in ruins, Germany was defeated, Japan was defeated, and those were major competitors of the United States before the world war. France was severely weakened, Britain was barely holding on to its empire and was extremely weak financially and economically. In the Third World there was a great clamor for independence and many of the old European colonial powers were on the verge of losing their positions in the Third World. So it looked like a very unstable and very inviting world to those people in the United States who thought that the United States could use its huge military might. And in fact, the United States emerged from the war not only unscathed, but greatly strengthened, economically and militarily, and the idea of Pax Americana, of reorganizing the world according to American standards and in American interests was very, very much on the minds of U.S. policy makers.

And they were able to persuade the country to go along with this expansionist idea only by means of using the Soviet threat, because if they just laid the facts straight on the table and said: Look, we want to control the world, the American people wouldn't support that. In the first place it was too dangerous; in the second place they didn't want to pay for the military muscle that was necessary for that; and in the third place they didn't want to throw the money around the world. And there was great opposition. But after several years of hammering out at the idea that the Soviet Union is out to take over the world and that communism is a world-wide threat, they were able to build up domestic support for this expansionist program of creating a huge network of military bases, military alliances, economic mechanisms designed to reorganize the world as a Pax Americana-ist world in the American way. And that is the real reason why there was the arms race, this expansionist idea.

Let me quote some very responsible reports of a very, you know, respected institute, the London Institute of Strategic Studies, which states -- and I believe their figures are right, not because their figures are in our favor, but because I (?myself) -- it's a very serious, you know, institution -- that in the last decade, the U.S. and NATO countries spent on military needs more than we to the tune of $300 billion. Those are the facts I would like to bring to the notice of our American listeners, and I would like them to make their own conclusions -- who is right, who is wrong.

[Posner] Dr Plekhanov, I think that you would agree that whenever there is an argument between two people, two sides, between husband and wife, whatever, it is natural to say that both sides are wrong. And therefore the argument that both sides are wrong, or are responsible, here seems to be a very plausible one and a very human one. Could you in all honesty as a human being say that nonetheless that argument does not hold water in this particular area of Soviet-American relations.

[Plekhanov] Well, I think that argument reflects another human trait, and usually two people who can't solve their conflict are blamed for continuing the conflict if they don't work enough on finding solutions, if they just keep blaming each other. So I think the key to the current situation is not only to identify the blame and responsibility -- that is important to set the record straight -- but the key thing is to find solutions which are acceptable to both sides and in the interests of both sides which are fair, balanced, equitable and so on. And it is in that area that one should really judge the performance of both sides. And I think that our side is doing whatever it can and bringing forth proposals, coming up with solutions,

offering options which mean that we are prepared to walk our half of the mile, and so on. So we are really trying to break up the deadlock. We are not content with simply stating the responsibility of the American side that it's their fault, so let them get the world out of this predicament. We don't think so. We think that the equal responsibility lies on both sides for finding solutions and -- but again this is a case of, you know, it takes two to tango -- and we can bring forth the best possible solutions, come up with the best possible ideas. But if there is no acceptance on the other side, if there is no willingness on the other side to deal with this problem on the basis of equality, fair play, and good faith, and not trying to damage the other side, and to gain advantages over the other side, then the arms race will certainly continue.

[Posner] I think the proposals that you've been talking about, Dr Plekhanov, have been very clearly stated by Mikhail Gorbachev, the three-stage way of moving toward total nuclear disarmement by the year 2000, and I think that also expresses the will that you talked about, Dr Bogdanov, the will in the practical sense. And, of course, depending on how that proposal is ultimately treated by the United States, I think that we will see what this world is going to be. It also, I think, reflects quite clearly who is deeply, fundamentally, and sincerely interested in peace and stopping the arms race. Well, that's all on "Top Priority" today.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

SOVIET EXPERTS EVALUATE NEW ARMS INITIATIVE

LD041735 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 4 Feb 86

[Passages in quotes spoken in Russian fading into English translation]

[Excerpts] The Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on how to bring about nuclear disarmament by the year 2000 has evoked keen international interest.

In the following program you can hear experts' opinions on the Soviet proposals. The Soviet experts are Dr Grigoriy Khozin, disarmament specialist Lev Semeyko, and correspondent of the daily PRAVDA, Vladimir Bolshakov. First here is Lev Semeyko.

[Semeyko] "Originally there was talk about limiting nuclear arms, then about limiting and reducing them. It was proposed that these actions be carried out to rid humanity of the nuclear menace and yet the final goal was in a foggy future. Under the Soviet plan nuclear arms are to be limited, reduced, and ultimately, scrapped altogether in specific time limits binding on all parties to the process, in stages. The proposals affect the armaments of all the five nuclear powers and every one of them can see the role it has to play and the things it has to do, and the deadlines too. This is an elaborate mechanism, an integral mechanism for eliminating the nuclear threat."

[Announcer] What are Dr Grigoriy Khozin's views about the Soviet statement?

[Khozin] "It seems to me that this document is a philosophical basis for the activities not only of this country, which have been unchanged, but also the activities of all countries. The basic principle is this: Don't try to seek solutions to your problems in developing new weapons and expanding your arsenals, but try to look for ways of ridding the world of weapons. The threat is too great. The world needs to learn new thinking and new action."

[Announcer] The Soviet plan for nuclear disarmament does provide for abandoning stereotypes and rigid old mentality. Now isn't it the greatest task that's facing the human race?

[Khozin] "It goes without saying that it's much more difficult to pursue a consistent policy for attaining humanitarian ideals, as the Soviet Union does, than to whip up the arms race. Might is right is a formula that does not require political wisdom. The caveman had to live with big sticks, but we can't live forever side by side with nuclear weapons and extol them as a guarantee of peace and well-being and at the same time speak of the need to get rid of them. Certainly, changing mentality is one of the most difficult problems, but the Soviet Union is showing how this can be done. It has prolonged

its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 31 March. The Soviet plan for scrapping nuclear arms does not dodge very complicated and at times delicate issues such as verification, the participation of third countries, or regional security. It's open for all. It calls for searching for solutions to all difficult problems."

[Announcer] The Soviet Union and the United States are the largest nuclear powers so the solution of these problems depends largely on them. How has the United States reacted to the Soviet plan for nuclear disarmament? Vladimir Bolshakov.

[Bolshakov] "Unlike previous times, the reaction of the West, including the United States, has been positive on the whole. The plan has not been rejected out of hand and has not been branded as mere propaganda. President Reagan has said that the statement is being carefully studied and this is the first time the Soviet Union has proposed eliminating nuclear weapons altogether. Now I'm afraid that the Soviet Union proposed destroying nuclear weapons back in 1946. In their comments on the President's remarks, especially his appreciation of this proposal, American newspapers have interpreted this as a sign that the President is no longer a captive to his own bellicose rhetoric or of this rhetoric by his aides, as it happened in the past, though some of the presidential aides have not really abandoned their flair for anti-Soviet rhetoric. They can't evade, any more, serious discussion of nuclear disarmament and the nonmilitarization of space. The Soviet statement not only shows how nuclear arms can be phased out, although they constitute the greatest danger now. There are other dangerous weapons of mass destruction and the statement outlines a concrete plan of how to scrap chemical weapons and prevent the development of new means of destruction. It is proposed that these problems should be solved alongside the regional problem."

[Announcer] Now it stands to reason that if there's a program like this it should be necessary to begin drafting agreements without delay. Here again is Vladimir Bolshakov.

[Bolshakov] "Nobody is going to deprive the Western countries of the right to consider the Soviet proposal. So far no specific answer has been given, but some politicians in the United States and in the NATO leadership have been speculating that nuclear disarmament will not be in the West's best interests and that deterrent is the best guarantee to prevent war. Of course, this is warped logic."

[Announcer] But it's quite widespread in the West. Can it be that nuclear arms do guarantee security? Lev Semeyko.

[Semeyko] "The logic of the West is this: Nuclear arms have kept the peace for the past 40 years. But has it been a truly secure peace or simply the absence of war? It was only after the Soviet Union developed its own nuclear arms that there appeared a balance of strength, followed by a peace based on the fear of mutual destruction. But as long as there are nuclear arms which are modernized all the time there will be doctrines drawn up about using them. (?It be) enough to remember such American doctrines as a limited nuclear war, a preventive nuclear strike, a first strike, a protracted nuclear war, and others. Scientists and strategists are racking their brains on how nuclear weapons can be used and this may indeed happen sooner or later. Nuclear arms cannot be regarded as an insurance against war. They are too dangerous. The same applies to conventional weapons. Their level must be reduced all the time because a race in conventional arms may lead to a situation in which conventional weapons can become as destructive as nuclear weapons."

[Announcer] And now Vladimir Bolshakov.

[Bolshakov] "Humanity is dreaming of getting rid of nuclear arms. Many politicians have spoken of this dream in some way or another and President Reagan also referred to it in (?his) "star wars" speech in March 1983. But the Soviet proposals are much more attractive than this program to eliminate nuclear arms by developing a new type of arms, the "star wars" arms. Under the Soviet plan a trillion or more dollars will not have to be spent on SDI as a means of scrapping nuclear arms, nor does it go beyond the present-day technical capabilities."

[Announcer] The Soviet plan calls for removing the greatest danger to humanity over the next 15 years and for solving thousands of other intractable problems. But is it a feasible plan? Lev Semeyko.

[Semeyko] "It is feasible. I (?will) refer to President Reagan. When he heard of the Soviet proposal he said: Why not disarm further, let's disarm further. Let the United States propose its own plan for destroying nuclear arms even sooner, say, by 1990. The United States and the Soviet Union possess more than 90 percent of all nuclear arms. If they agree to disarm this would be a realistic situation indeed. Britain, France, and China say that if the Soviet Union and the United States cut down on their nuclear potentials, they will be ready to join in a multilateral process of nuclear disarmament. The Soviet plan suggests that at first the Soviet Union and the United States reduce their arsenals on a bilateral basis, which means that the process can then become multilateral. The Soviet program is feasible also because it complies with the demands of the lesser nuclear powers."

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

U.S. SENATOR KENNEDY MEETS WITH SOVIET OFFICIALS IN MOSCOW

Soviet Parliamentary Group

LD051447 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 5 TASS -- A meeting with U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy has taken place at the Committee of the Soviet Parliamentary Group today.

It was stressed in the conversation which took place that ties and contacts between the parliaments of the two countries had become more intensive in the recent period. This contributes to better mutual understanding, to narrowing differences of opinion on various questions of our time and to strengthening state-to-state relations.

It was noted that cooperation should grow in the interests of peace, detente and international security. The Soviet Union is doing everything possible to avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe. This is illustrated by the peace initiatives of the Soviet State. This cause is also promoted by a program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons, formulated in detail by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement. The United States' agreement to the Soviet proposals could make it possible to prevent the spread of the arms race into space and to build trust between countries and peoples. The ending of nuclear weapon tests constitutes an important step towards the limitation of the arms race. The Soviet Union extended to March 31 the unilateral moratorium on such tests, announced by it last August, and called upon the USA to follow its example.

Edward Kennedy expressed his thanks for the opportunity to visit the Soviet Union and to hold conversations. He stressed the importance of the further extension of the dialogue and, in view of the interests of both countries, of a search for ways to end the arms race. The senator expressed a positive view of the latest Soviet proposals, inter alia, those on arms control, and spoke in favour of an early search by the two countries of accords on the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons.

Deputy chairmen of the Parliamentary Group of the USSR, Avgust Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Vadim Zagladin, a deputy to the USSR Supreme Soviet, took part in the conversation.

A luncheon was given in honour of the senator on behalf of the Committee of the Parliamentary Group of the USSR.

Shevardnadze Receives Kennedy

LD051934 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1828 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 5 Feb (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign affairs minister today received an outstanding U.S. political figure, Senator Edward Kennedy, who is visiting Moscow.

The present state of and prospects for Soviet-U.S. relations in light of accords reached at the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva were discussed in general terms.

Eduard Shevardnadze drew the senator's attention to the USSR's historically significant initiative -- a program for a total and universal elimination of nuclear weapons, given a ban on space strike weapons, set forth in CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of 15 January.

Soviet-U.S. cooperation in the implementation of this bold and carefully elaborated plan would be conducive not only to a decisive breakthrough in mankind's struggle against a nuclear threat, but also to a radical improvement in relations between our two countries.

The new Soviet initiatives, reinforced by such a major unilateral step as the extension of the nuclear tests moratorium, create the necessary preconditions for advancing toward the objective of eliminating nuclear weapons and for reaching accords at the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space armaments. In connection with this it is essential for the U.S. side, including in the U.S. Congress, to manifest a responsible and constructive approach, so that the opportunity which has appeared for the cause of peace is not missed.

Edward Kennedy spoke in favor of progress in the cause of a practical limitation of armaments and for the normalisation and progressive development of Soviet-U.S. relations in general.

Gorbachev Receives Kennedy

LD061944 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Feb 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, in the Kremlin, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev received U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy, who is visiting the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Since the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, Comrade Gorbachev noted, the prerequisites have been created for the normalization [vypravleniye] of relations between our two countries, and many leading U.S. political figures declare themselves in favor of this. But today it is not enough merely to pay verbal tribute to an understanding of the danger of the situation which has arisen.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed that a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting should yield practical results, and be marked by serious progress in the directions most important for the cause of peace. Otherwise such a meeting would be devoid of meaning. The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to ensure that this will be so. Evidence of this

is the program we proposed for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in the period up to the year 2000 given that there is a ban on space strike weapons. This program contains specific and realistic formulas for achieving accords in all spheres, embracing nuclear, chemical and conventional weapons, and moreover, it makes provision for reliable and strict verification.

The Soviet program would make it possible for mankind to avoid the colossal danger lying in wait for the international community should it allow itself to be drawn into new adventures. In the 15 years that the authors of the U.S. "star wars" program allot for experiments which are allegedly intended to try out the recipes for nuclear disarmament by way of space armaments, we propose that the earth be freed of nuclear armaments.

Although nuclear test sites continue to function in the United States, and not only there, the Soviet Union has extended for a further 3 months its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. We consider, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, the total cessation of nuclear tests to be extremely important.

During the conversation there was a detailed discussion of the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union for the elimination of all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone. Replying to Senator Kennedy's questions, Comrade Gorbachev explained that, like the proposal for ending nuclear explosions, it is not accompanied by any conditions except for a renunciation of a build-up of the corresponding nuclear weapons by Britain and France and the non-transfer of such weapons to other countries by the United States.

The Soviet program for nuclear disarmament provides a unique chance not only for radically changing Soviet-U.S. relations for the better, but also for turning peoples' most cherished dream of lasting peace into a reality. This chance must not be missed.

Senator Kennedy voiced a number of considerations which, in his view, could promote progress toward a reduction of armaments.

There was also an exchange of views on other questions connected with the need for better mutual understanding, conditional upon a recognition of the principle of non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Edward Kennedy thanked the CPSU Central Committee general secretary for the opportunity to hold a frank and meaningful conversation.

Kennedy Addresses Academy

LD062004 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 6 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 6 TASS -- "I welcome the constructive new suggestions in Mikhail Gorbachev's recent proposal." This is what Senator Edward Kennedy said about the Soviet programme for the complete elimination of nuclear arms everywhere by the year 2000. He arrived in Moscow on Tuesday and addressed the USSR Academy of Sciences today.

"It would be foolish for any of us to pretend that there are no profound differences between our societies and our governments", the Senator said. "But for destinies [as received] are inescapably intertwined in what has become the overriding challenge of our time -- to avert the nuclear holocaust".

Edward Kennedy emphasized the importance of the Geneva meeting of the leaders of the two powers due to which the hope for the establishment of mutual understanding between the two countries has emerged. Edward Kennedy noted that many people in the West have serious reservations about the consequences of any new escalation of the arms race, especially the development of anti-missile systems in space.

Senator Kennedy holds that the role of scientists in the prevention of a nuclear menace must increase. He spoke highly of the activity of the movement "international physicians for the prevention of nuclear war" which was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1985. He is of the opinion that the results of the Geneva summit will promote the widening of Soviet-American scientific cooperation which is in the interests of both countries. "Yet political confrontation too often narrows the horizons of scientific cooperation." A lot has been achieved however, even in conditions of a limited cooperation of scientists of the two countries, he noted.

Describing the state of scientific ties between the two countries, the Senator, specifically, pointed out that the fusion experiments at Princeton University depend in large measure on insights developed by Soviet colleagues. "And as I speak to you today, American instruments are being transported on a Soviet rocket flying through the heavens towards its rendezvous with Halley's Comet", Edward Kennedy said. In his opinion, the world should become, for scientists, an international laboratory in which they can speak freely with each other, and collaborate freely in peaceful research and discovery.

Edward Kennedy paid special attention to the question of arms control. "More sophisticated technologies have emerged in recent years to monitor and evaluate nuclear tests and other military activities," the Senator said.

"It is time for scientists to apply them systematically to solve problems in the area of verification." Without this, in his opinion, peace cannot be achieved on earth. It is necessary to strive for greater openness and confidence in relations between the USSR and USA, the guest noted.

"I look forward to a time when the hundreds of billions of dollars and roubles that we expend each year on engines of war will be spent on instruments of peace", Edward Kennedy said. "In recent years, it has often seemed that we are passing through a long winter of discontent on arms control and the other issues that divide us. But our feeling today is that we are finally emerging into a springtime of hope. Let us redouble our efforts to transform that tentative sense of anticipation into tangible steps of accomplishment".

Academician Aleksandrov Speaks

LD62013 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 6 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow February 6 TASS -- "If just one of the medium-range missiles deployed in Europe explodes accidentally, the continent will become uninhabitable in two-three minutes," the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences has declared, warning against the nuclear threat looming large over mankind. Academician Anatoily Aleksandrov addressed a meeting of Soviet scientists with American Senator Edward Kennedy at the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences here today.

It is extremely important that concrete steps be undertaken with a view to achieving an accord on the reduction of nuclear armaments and preventing the militarization of outer space, Academician Aleksandrov stressed.

"Nuclear systems, like rocketry, may sometimes malfunction and break down," the academician said. "Regrettably, the recent disaster that struck the American spacecraft Challenger attests to the insufficient reliability of technology. Any missile positioned in Europe may behave in a just as unpredictable way."

Progress in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, that became apparent after the Geneva Summit, and the recent statement by Mikhail Gorbachev show that before the beginning of the third millennium mankind will have to finally resolve the question of eliminating all types of weapons that threaten mankind. Otherwise, it may just be too late, the scientist pointed out.

The Soviet programme of total disarmament is a guide for action for all who are not indifferent to the fate of the planet, Aleksandrov said.

"I welcome Senator Edward Kennedy's arrival in the Soviet Union, and regard it as an important step towards establishing mutual understanding and closer Soviet-American Cooperation for the benefit of the two countries and the peoples of the entire world," Academician Aleksandrov stressed in conclusion.

Kennedy Speaks on Moscow TV

LD091902 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1610 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Statement by Senator Edward Kennedy on 7 February prior to his departure from Moscow; place not given; recorded in English fading into superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] I have come to the Soviet Union at a time of sorrow for my country. Last week we lost seven astronauts, who were brave explorers of the dangerous ocean of space. We are grateful to the Soviet Government and to the Soviet people for their sympathy and condolences, and, like you, we are fully determined to continue work on one of the greatest tasks confronting mankind.

I also came to the Soviet Union at a heartening time for relations between our countries. A meeting took place between the leaders of our two states, and for the first time of late, from this height, we saw hope of a better future.

There are many fields which continue to divide as before. This will also be the case in the future too, but there are also links of memory and history which bring us close together. American families like Soviet families knew the burden of the great war, in which our peoples fought side by side. One of the clearest memories of my childhood were the sorrowful times, which affected the whole of my family, too. My brother Joe was a fighter pilot and died during a dangerous operation over the English Channel. My sister's husband Billy was killed during the liberation of France. My brother Jack, who later became President of the United States, was almost killed. He was a lieutenant in the Navy.

President Kennedy deeply understood the scale of sacrifice made by the Soviet people during the war. In the speech which led to the conclusion of the treaty banning nuclear tests in 1963, the first treaty which broke the ice of the cold war, he told his fellow countrymen: No other country in the history

of war has ever suffered as the Soviet Union suffered during World War II. At least 20 million people died. Countless millions of homes and villages were burnt and destroyed. President Kennedy reckoned highly the courage of the Soviet people, and recalled that our two great countries had never been at war with each other. Thank God, those words are still valid now, 23 years later.

The Soviet Union and the United States have gone through times of tensions and confrontation, have come to deadends at the talks table. But we have never crossed the line beyond which war is able to destroy the whole of mankind. The greatest task of our time, the greatest responsibility of all time, is the defense and preservation of peace, when the possibility of the end of mankind exists if at the push of a button missiles are launched and there is a nuclear explosion. Both countries must spend less time on preparations for nuclear war and more time on preventing it. Even now our nuclear arsenals contain the equivalent of 3 million bombs such as that dropped on Hiroshima. This is 4 tons of TNT for every person on the planet, including children.

Neither of our countries can permit itself to chase after the phantom of nuclear superiority, for if we do, the world will be drained, and finally impoverished. For the American people and the Soviet people the concept of national security contains the idea of the quality of their society and the quantity of our arsenals. Every new missile silo means fewer houses for our families. Instead of competing against each other for the number of bombs and warheads we have and the amount of money we spend on military ends, which leads to an increase in the instruments for waging war, let us compete, and where possible cooperate, in guaranteeing peace.

A year ago, on a high mountain plateau in the Ethiopian desert, I saw Soviet trucks carrying American grain for the starving. None of the victims was interested in whether there was a red star on the trucks or the stars and stripes on the bags of grain. In that brief moment, in that terrible place, I saw what could happen if our two countries acted for the sake of common aims instead of reacting to each other with their usual hostility.

This does not mean that all our differences can now be overcome. Perhaps that will never happen. We will stand in contradiction to each other for a long time to come, in philosophy, in economics, in our understanding of human rights. We will assert our views. We will argue about them, but I hope it will always be peacefully. At the same time we must seek new ways to solve old antagonisms and the continuing regional conflicts: in Central America, South Africa, and Afghanistan. Too many mothers in our two countries have been how their sons, the pride of our nations, have returned home in their coffins.

Above all we must not allow regional conflicts to become the start of global war. We must not interpret our inevitable differences in such a way that they undermine our incontestable common goal -- the insistent requirement for nuclear arms control. We cannot have a world which ensures survival unless we follow the ideal of President Kennedy, who saw the world in its diversity.

I think that the leaders of the two countries understand that truth now. I think that General Secretary Gorbachev is ready for talks on real reduction in nuclear arms. He has said that in a nuclear war there can be no victors. I think that President Reagan is also ready to agree with this, because, as he has said, that nuclear war cannot be won and must not be started.

Before I left I had a meeting with Reagan, and he stressed the importance that he attaches to success at the Geneva talks. The task of the Geneva talks is to translate lofty intentions into great deeds and to discuss one point after another patiently -- despite the profound differences -- and persistently, despite the existing feeling of danger. We must remain at the negotiating table until we reach agreement. The possibilities exist for reaching agreement even on the most complex problem, where the differences are the most evident; that is, on the question of President Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. For my part, I have stated publicly that I am against the militarization of space. But in fairness let me remind you that President Reagan sees in SDI a way of making nuclear weapons unnecessary and nuclear war impossible. General Secretary Gorbachev sees it as the latest offensive weaponry providing both a shield and the means of dealing a first strike. However, both President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev have spoken of the fact that they wish to see a world without nuclear wars. In order to turn this dream into a reality, both sides must seek a compromise, which could cut the Gordian knot at negotiations.

Neither of the sides can permit itself, by becoming entangled in this problem, to lose the opportunity now existing to limit nuclear arms and avert a first strike from any side, whether from the ground or from the sky. We can barely imagine the scale of the threat that now exists. Both our countries are flooded with weapons that could bring more death and suffering than any conflict in the past. The greatest works of human genius could be reduced to ashes by mankind's most terrible work of creation.

In short, we are walking on the knife edge of nuclear confrontation, barely able to maintain an unstable equilibrium: slipping and then holding on only at the last second. Despite all our bombs and missiles, we are standing essentially unarmed on the stage which may be destroyed in a single second. We live with this every day, but it is impossible to live like this forever.

Our generation has in its hands the most incredible power that has ever been known to mankind. Either we shall conquer the fire, or it will conquer us. Together we shall either continue the book of history, or else we shall close it.

Kennedy, Zorin Discuss Visit

LD091930 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1610 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Conversation between U.S. Senator Edward Kennedy and political observer Valentin Zorin, on 7 February; Kennedy in English with superimposed Russian translation -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Zorin] Senator, I have listened with interest to your address, and I would like to ask you several questions. First of all, I would like to ask you about your impressions of your meeting and conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Kennedy] First of all, I would like to say that the conversation was cordial and friendly. The general secretary gave me the impression of a lively, energetic and knowledgeable leader, who clearly understands the importance and significance of attempts to reach agreement on issues of the nuclear arms race, not only with the United States but also with other nuclear powers. He has put forward a very comprehensive program which my government is presently studying and to which it expects to give a response. I think that a real opportunity for progress exists.

I came away from the meeting with the general secretary, as I did from the meeting with the foreign minister, convinced that it is now possible to achieve substantial progress. These issues are very complex; they concern the problem of the national security of both our countries, which is a matter of vital importance. I very much hope that the possibility for a positive solution of them exists.

[Zorin] I would like to say that there exists what I would call a Kennedy family tradition: President John Kennedy, Senator Robert Kennedy and Senator Edward Kennedy are well known as politicians who have favored and do favor arms control. As a representative of this famous family, I would like to ask you something. You have already touched upon it, but I would like you to speak in greater detail about your attitude to the comprehensive program which has now been put forward by the Soviet Union in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the general secretary, and all the more since the Soviet public cannot fail to notice the fact that it will soon be a month since the proposal was made, but no response has yet come from Washington.

[Kennedy] First of all, I am not a member of the executive apparatus. I have been a member of the Senate for 23 years, and I personally consider this proposal constructive. This program concerns the whole set of nuclear relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and deserves thorough study. A preliminary examination makes it possible for me to convince myself that it contains great possibilities, and inspires great hopes that agreement may be attained, in particular on such a serious problem as medium-range nuclear weapons in Central Europe. In other aspects as well, the program deserves the most attentive study.

For a long time I have supported a treaty on ending nuclear tests; that has been my stance in the U.S. Senate for many years. I remember that President Kennedy considered that the partial agreement on ending nuclear tests which was signed during his presidency was his most important contribution to the cause of peace.

I know that at that time, during the talks, an attempt was begun to achieve accord on the total banning of nuclear tests. Such an agreement was almost reached in 1979 and 1980 between Great Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva. I was present at those talks. I remain until now an ardent supporter of such an agreement. General Secretary Gorbachev stated that the Soviet Union is energetically coming out in favor of achieving this goal. At present, the United States does not take this stance. But I would like to hope that we will be able to make progress, just as in other spheres of the overall strategic balance, and will adhere to observance of the existing ABM treaty, and that this will not be violated.

[Zorin] The question of the so-called violations was raised many times; it is used by those who, say, are against putting an end to testing. But the new proposals of the Soviet Union contain far-reaching proposals on control, very radical proposals, and I think that this makes it easier -- if Washington really has such a desire -- to ban all kinds of nuclear tests. What is your opinion?

[Kennedy] The proposals contained in the recommendations of General Secretary Gorbachev envision the most radical means of control, exceeding all the previous ones. The technological progress in the course of the last few years, as far as calibrating underground nuclear explosions is concerned, makes it reasonable to suggest that both the Soviet Union and the United States can develop systems for evaluating the power of nuclear explosions. If that happens, any opposition to such agreement can be defeated easily. I consider this to be very constructive and important. The main thing I will take with me from the Soviet Union is the opportunity to discuss those issues frankly and constructively. This, in my opinion, reflects the seriousness with which Soviet officials approach these problems. I will undoubtedly take this feeling back home.

[Zorin] What is your personal attitude toward the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan, particularly, as you are the person who called this initiative "star wars"?

[Kennedy] [laughter] Have you read my article? I have expressed in the United States my opposition to the Strategic Defense Initiative; I talked about this to the general secretary. I am a firm believer in the ABM Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union. In Congress I voted for allocating funds for research in this field. The research in this field, as you well know, is also carried out in the Soviet Union. Each country has to have an opportunity for limited research in the atmosphere, research that does not violate the ABM Treaty. I know that your leadership spoke on this vividly and passionately, including the general secretary. In the United States I will adhere to the same position -- maintaining the ABM Treaty.

[Zorin] Senator, I recall the conversation we had together in your office 10 years ago and you...And I remember that you said that the American people were disturbed by problems of its own security. Over these years Washington has spent billions of dollars on defense. What do you think? As a result of this has the American people's security increased? And where do you see the real path toward achieving this security in today's world?

[Kennedy] Well, first of all there has been a considerable buildup in the United States in the field of national security and defense. Frankly speaking I believe that the need to build up conventional armaments did exist. We had to maintain our combat readiness. We have a dual obligation. If an agreement exists limiting the possibility of nuclear conflict then we will not be completely dependent upon nuclear arsenals. If there is a flare-up in some part of the world -- perhaps even an accidental conflict -- or a mistake in interpreting the other side's actions, we have to count exclusively upon nuclear weapons.

So there was a need to increase the reliability of our conventional armaments. I am opposed to some types of weapons which, from my point of view, do not provide sufficient security. I have spoken about this during debates in the U.S. Senate.

[Zorin] It is known that during the year that has just begun there is to be a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. As you are one of the most authoritative political figures in the United States, I would like to ask you what you expect from this meeting?

[Kennedy] I hope that agreement will be reached between our countries on theater nuclear armaments. And I hope that we will return to the issue of a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. I hope that all this will be examined in such a way that we will be able to reach some positive results. I think that now the main problem is to find ways of restraining the arms race. This is consistent with the security interests both of the United States and of the Soviet Union. I think that there is a possibility of this. I also think that everything we agree about will be able to be verified without difficulty by both sides. I think that despite our differences the issues will be resolved. I think it is very important to understand that accords will lead to an improvement in the overall climate.

And another field, too, in which we would be able to agree on cooperation is that of space. A great tragedy took place recently in the United States. You, too, have had tragedies. I think that we will be able to find fields not for competition and militarization in space, but for cooperation. I think that our leaders will think about this.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

USSR'S KOBYSH, PRIMAKOV DISCUSS GORBACHEV INITIATIVES

PM041605 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 5 Feb 86 p 14

["Dialogue between journalist Vitaliy Kobysh and Academician Yevgeniy Primakov on the situation in the world after the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee": "On the Threshold of the Third Millenium"]

[Text] Vitaliy Kobysh: Our readers are already well acquainted with the large-scale package of new Soviet foreign policy initiatives set forth in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. I would like once again to draw attention to the following. First, this is a proposal for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere. Second, it is a comprehensive package of measures aimed at completely stopping the arms race, in all its component parts, under a single plan: The Soviet proposals provide for the elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction, a general ban on all types of arms which have characteristics approximating such weapons, and a sharp reduction in conventional arms. Third, for the first time a time frame is set and specific stages defined for the attainment of this goal. Fourth, all the differences of opinion -- real and speculative -- which have hitherto existed with regard to verification are removed. Lastly, in order to stimulate and advance this process the Soviet Union has unilaterally adopted the difficult decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear tests.

Yevgeniy Primakov: I think it should be stressed: All this has been done at an extraordinary, exceptional moment in the course of history. The present period is characterized, on the one hand, by the exceptionally serious threat of war which hangs over the world, but on the other, by a more real possibility than in the past of eliminating that threat. All mankind is in one boat, tossed by huge waves. And in these conditions some people, intentionally or otherwise, are rocking the boat. The result is a dangerous situation for everyone. At the present time the population of the globe -- regardless of whether or not any given section of that population is a direct participant in the confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, the Warsaw Pact and NATO -- faces the problem of survival. That is a recognized fact. In any event, it is recognized by the vast majority of thinking people. But what to do in these circumstances, how to escape the danger of universal annihilation, what new approaches are needed, what new assessments should be made of particular phenomena, what new motives should guide us in our actions -- these are the most urgent, the most important questions today and they need weighty, concrete answers.

Kobysh: You said that the present moment is also characterized by a more real possibility than before of eliminating the looming threat. But this conclusion, which I share, presupposes that there are also forces on the other side -- I mean, first and

foremost, leadership figures -- who could meet us halfway. Thus, although, unfortunately, the Geneva summit meeting has not yet been followed by any clear signs of a cardinal change in the position of the U.S. leaders, it is evidently possible all the same to count on a certain constructiveness in their future position.

Primakov: The very fact of President Reagan's participation in the Geneva summit meeting is, in my view, a good illustration of what you mean. And on returning to the United States from Geneva, he spoke to Congress and put forward mainly peace-loving principles. What lies behind this? As far as Reagan as an individual is concerned, it seems to me that several aspects must be borne in mind. First, whatever one's sympathies or antipathies toward the President, I should think that, having all the necessary information at his disposal, he cannot fail to be aware of the reality of the threat hanging over the world. I think that was what did the most to push him toward Geneva.

The second aspect is a certain change in public opinion. It had changed considerably even before Geneva, especially at the time when we literally begin to escalate our peace proposals, including unilateral measures in the arms reduction sphere. Nonetheless public opinion started to change radically as a result of the Geneva meeting. These changes are largely influenced by the fact that the Soviet Union made very effective use of formerly unexploited reserves. Take just one example -- our current approach to questions of verification [kontrol]. The Soviet position on this question was expounded both during the Geneva talks and in M.S. Gorbachev's statement. The crux of it is the Soviet Union's readiness to accept practically any forms of verification, including international verification or on-site inspections [inspektsiya], but of course, only if an accord is reached on the essence of the problems concerned. Everyone knows that the question of verification has always been a subject of U.S. speculations. People there tried to prove that their unwillingness to conclude agreements in the nuclear arms reduction sphere was supposedly dictated by the fact that we are a "closed society" and do not allow verification of particular accords. The Soviet Union has now completely eliminated the possibility of the use of such "arguments." Is this influencing public opinion? Yes, of course. In these conditions it is more difficult for Reagan to reject the accords reached in Geneva and avoid participating in their implementation.

Third. Reagan is clearly not averse to going down in history as a man who took a positive step in the direction of peace, as a peacemaker.

I think all these motives behind Reagan's behavior cannot be viewed in isolation from certain objective assessments. It is well known that capitalism and U.S. militarism are similar, even kindred concepts. At the same time, it seems to me that it would be wrong to represent U.S. capitalism as a system which cannot exist or develop without militarism. I also think it would be wrong to represent the political superstructure which rests on the state monopoly foundations of the United States as being linked once and for all with the process of the arms race and with preparations for war. For all its class homogeneity, that superstructure does not, in general, consist only of people who adhere to uniformly extremist, militarist views. There are people in the top echelons of power in the United States who are capable of realistic thinking and who realize that to set the goal of destroying socialism by military means is ultimately to work toward self-destruction.

Kobysh: M.S. Gorbachev's statement not only caught the U.S. Administration unawares, but, judging from the observations of U.S. analysts, gave rise to serious disagreements in its ranks. In fact, this is nothing new. It is well known that even while President Reagan was in the plane flying to Geneva, Defense Secretary C. Weinberger sent him a letter insistently demanding that he avoid any agreements with the Soviet leadership.

The question arises: Did Weinberger himself leak the contents of the secret message addressed to Reagan? If so, then evidently his aim was to severely restrict Reagan's opportunities for compromise and perhaps, even to wreck the possibility of achieving positive results in Geneva. But what if Reagan himself originated the leak, in order to show that his hands are tied and that he cannot make any radical agreements?

Be that as it may, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, you and I were in Geneva when it happened and it did not have the appearance of a mere isolated episode. The publication of Weinberger's secret letter, by all appearances, reflected a clash of different interests in the U.S. ruling class. We heard the president's national security adviser McFarlane, inundated by journalists' questions at a press conference in Geneva and in a state of considerable confusion, stating that an investigation will be carried out in Washington at once.

He was asked: an investigation by Pentagon bodies or by the White House? He replied: the White House.

Primakov: But it appears that the question sank without trace.

Kobysh: No, it did not sink -- it was sunk. And who sank it remains unclear to this day. What is clear is this: McFarlane was forced to resign as a result of differences of opinion with White House Chief of Staff D. Regan.

Here a very serious question arises: Is there some kind of confrontation, with Shultz and to some extent Reagan on once side (though that is, of course, relative; the President can hardly be called even a "centrist"), and Weinberger, Casey, and other diehard representatives of the military-industrial complex on the other? What is this? A crack in U.S. capitalism? Disarray in the face of the problems posed by the approaching third millennium? Or purely U.S. pragmatism: the struggle for a "place in the sun" and for profit, too?

Be that as it may, "profound differences have now emerged" in the U.S. Administration. Those are not my words. That is what THE WASHINGTON POST writes. Incidentally, the same newspaper made a remark on the disagreements which exist: "They are hardly an excuse for the administration's failure to prepare a prompt response (to M.S. Gorbachev's statement) which would advance the dialogue in the arms reduction sphere."

Primakov: The impression created is that in the U.S. leadership there is no complete or comprehensive consensus even on a question on which the leadership's attitude appears monolithic -- the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

But perhaps that is why, in its propaganda activity, the U.S. Administration tries so stubbornly to appear united and unshakable. SDI is unanimously presented by official propaganda in the United States as a fundamentally new idea for preserving peace.

Today, as is known, the so-called "deterrence" is based on the military-strategic balance. It could evidently be characterized as the inability of either side to prevent a devastating retaliatory nuclear strike. The Soviet Union is always raising the question of the need to lower the level of that balance while preserving the sides' identical security. That is our philosophy. And in these conditions Washington proclaims SDI as a new "mechanism" which will supposedly ensure stability in international relations. It is represented as some kind of salvation from "mutual terror," a new basis for "deterrence," a means directed against a first strike by either side.

It is true that the present mechanism for deterrence -- and here it is worth saying that it did not emerge because the Soviet Union wanted it; we were forced to take part in the arms race and ultimately to achieve military-strategic parity with the United States -- does, of course, have many defects, including psychological and moral defects. But what is offered as a substitute?

To begin with, Soviet scientists and many leading U.S. scientists working in this sphere believe, with every justification, that there is no possibility of creating even a highly effective -- let alone an absolutely reliable -- means of destroying first-strike missiles from space. True, some people in the United States claim that it is possible to eliminate a significant percentage of such missiles. Well, let us say 70 percent. But if one side knows that 70 percent of its missile potential could be destroyed, it will naturally seek to ensure that the 30 percent of undestroyed missile potential amounts to considerably more missiles than before -- not 100, say, but 1,000. This means that an unrestrained offensive arms race will be unleashed.

SDI -- Castles in Space?

Kobysh: That is so obvious, even to U.S. scientists -- I mean the thorough researchers -- that the question arises: Is it a question of some well thought out military plan which someone is imposing on the United States, and thence on the whole world, or is it nothing more than ambition on the part of the U.S. ruling class, ambition which runs counter to all common sense?

It is not easy to get to the bottom of this question now. Even in serious academic publications published in the United States, the situation is deliberately confused. In particular, they develop the idea that scientific and technical competition in space between the Soviet Union and the United States has supposedly been going on for a long time and has always affected the military sphere one way or another. This competition, such publications assert, was proceeding of its own accord. Then Reagan brought politicking into it, declaring publicly that the United States sets the goal of surpassing the Soviet Union in military research in space. In other words, the idea is insinuated that SDI always existed objectively, but neither the Soviet Union nor the United States suspected it: Just like Moliere's hero who did not know he was speaking prose. Here the main question is deliberately clouded: whether strike weapons are being put in space or whether it is only a question of exercises of a purely scientific order.

This political justification, so to speak, for the "star wars" program is, as you see, rather cunning.

Now I would like to touch on another problem -- how far U.S. big business is already involved in the SDI program. It is clear from press reports that 1,500 U.S. corporations have expressed the desire to take part and some are already taking part in the program to prepare for "star wars." They have been assigned orders for decades to

come: Sums amounting to billions, tens of billions, and even hundreds of billions of dollars are mentioned.

Primakov: You are right, Vitaliy Ivanovich, to formulate the problem in that way. Thousands of proposals have already been submitted by various U.S. firms and laboratories under the SDI program -- more than under any other U.S. military program. The main programs for the majority of strategic offensive arms -- the new generations of MX, Trident, and B-1 strategic bombers -- will be completed in the early nineties. According to U.S. experts' estimates, by the end of the eighties the production of delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads will begin to fall, since the stockpiled arsenal is deemed "sufficient" in quantitative terms. As for qualitative improvements, these will be less "profitable" than at present, since increasing financial resources will have to be invested in any small qualitative improvement on existing types of armaments. Obviously, the U.S. military business can hardly count on support from Congress for new programs for the production of purely offensive weapons. Therefore, the so-called defensive -- really offensive -- space programs are regarded by U.S. military business as a panacea against possible reductions in profits.

Kobysh: What do you have in mind when you talk about business: individual corporations specializing entirely in military production or special subunits within them?

Primakov: Both.

Kobysh: That is probably correct, although the problem is not that simple. A U.S. corporation today, even the most "militarized" corporation, tries to diversify production as far as possible in order to be ready for any situation. In the Boeing company, for instance, I was shown a large-scale agricultural production unit, although everyone knows that this corporation specializes in the production of aircraft and missiles.

Primakov: Yes, but nonetheless we can make deductions from the actual size of the sums invested in military production and from the profits obtained from those investments. For instance, if you consider that from 1984 through 1989 $26 billion will be appropriated to the SDI scientific and technical program, then 22 percent of that sum, which is around 6 billion, will go to the Boeing company. You can imagine what kind of a sum that is!

There is another aspect. Many companies, closing their eyes to the mortal danger inherent in an arms race in space, want to use the implementation of the SDI program to increase their scientific and technical potential. And many representatives of the military business regard SDI in general as a unique catalyst for new ideas in the arms race, including ideas not related to space.

Kobysh: All the same, there are figures which indicate that a considerable part -- or rather the great part -- of the U.S. military-industrial complex, and not just business, has still not finally decided about SDI. The very nature of U.S. capitalism is such that an efficient corporation has to give its shareholders something tangible, not just castles in space. At the same time SDI is opposed by all who put survival above profits, all who are aware of the abyss into which this program is dragging the world. I think the main international obstacle of a politico-legal nature which could bar the way for the United States to slide further and further down toward the ideas of an arms race in space is the ABM Treaty signed by the Soviet Union and the United States in 1972. SDI is in total contradiction to the articles of this treaty.

That is doubtless why the representatives of leading corporations which have associated themselves with the "star wars" program are now engaged in active lobbying in the U.S. Congress and government circles in favor of an arbitrary interpretation of the provisions of the ABM Treaty. Moreover, these U.S. companies are not averse to profiting from Japanese and West European technology, although they are rather afraid of competition. This creates yet another mass of contradictions.

It would not be correct to think that the Washington administration is marching victoriously across the world, or even across the United States, with its "star wars" program. The main reasons why this program is giving rise to protests and being fiercely criticized are well known. There is another significant aspect which is sometimes forgotten when SDI is discussed.

The point is that the trillion-dollar "star wars" venture is clearly beyond the means of the United States, or at least beyond the means of its coffers today. In the next few months the state debt of the world's richest capitalist country will pass the $2 trillion mark -- that figure is written with 12 zeros. Of course, you could say that U.S. capitalism has "reserves of strength." But the captains of the U.S. ship of state, those who are most experienced and farsighted, know well that it was playing with zeroes like this that led to the catastrophic crisis of 1929-1933. Their thoughts are troubled now.

Primakov: All the same, the real attitude of the U.S. Administration, and that part of the military-industrial complex which is behind it, toward the SDI program shows how difficult the process which began in Geneva will be. It will undoubtedly have to make its way through the big obstacles, lofty barriers, and major accumulations which are not only left over from the past, but also result from the present U.S. policy.

But however difficult that process is, it is already perceptible. This was perhaps manifested in the fact that the U.S. Administration did not adopt its usual frankly negative stance on the latest proposals formulated in M.S. Gorbachev's statement. Of course, I am far from thinking that the United States has already agreed to the Soviet proposals.

But in the conditions of the change in public opinion, it can no longer ignore them; moreover, it cannot fail to react in a proper and, I would say, civilized way.

Washington cannot fail to take account of the reaction to the Soviet peace initiatives in other states too -- its allies and the developing countries. In this respect one can surely regard as characteristic the words of Rajiv Gandhi, who said that he congratulates M.S. Gorbachev on his statement, or Greek Prime Minister Papandreou's call for the Nonaligned Movement to play an important part in the implementation of the tasks set by the Soviet Union.

Kobysh: I would like to add something about the reaction of the U.S. allies. They are not very pleased that the U.S. Administration has so far confined itself to polite words, carefully avoiding giving a substantive response. The tactics of procrastination adopted by the administration, if they continue in the same way in future, could lead to the U.S. allies' beginning to rebel.

Primakov: In fact, the process we are speaking of has begun to affect, even if not in the most radical way, the policy of certain U.S. allies. It seems to be connected to some degree, for instance, with the positive developments in Soviet-Japanese

relations which emerged in the course of the visit to Japan by Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. I was in Japan on the eve of that visit and during my conversations with the Japanese Foreign Ministry leadership and with scientists belonging to the ruling party's so-called "brain trust," I formed a clear impression that Japan is afraid, to speak, of missing the "Geneva train." Many people have begun to realize than an immovable position on Japan's part with regard to the Soviet Union could be detrimental to Japan, especially in conditions where a process of normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States has already begun to emerge to some degree.

How To Cool Down the "Hot Spots"

Kobysh: We have been talking, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, about questions relating to the strategic arms sphere. There is another topic which is also directly connected with the peoples' security interests. That is the so-called regional conflicts, or, as journalists say, "the planet's hot spots." In Geneva M.S. Gorbachev warned against the crude approach whereby all regional crises without exception are seen from the standpoint of Soviet-U.S. confrontation.

One cannot fail to see the profound socioeconomic and political factors as a result of which particular local clashes flare up. The attempt to "globalize" these conflicts while ignoring the real interests of the peoples involved and the specific situation in each region will never lead to their just resolution.

Primakov: In this connection I would like to recall that John Foster Dulles once said: All clashes in the world, if they are not in the interests of the United States, form a kind of "vacuum" into which "the Soviet Union's influence" is inevitably drawn and therefore, the United States must itself fill that "vacuum." This imperial viewpoint formed the basis of aggressive U.S. actions in various parts of the world. It seems to me that in present-day conditions attempts to present all conflicts solely from the viewpoint of the possible strengthening of U.S. positions in the struggle against the Soviet Union constitute a continuation of Dulles' line.

Kobysh: Another natural law is the one whereby local conflict situations reach an international level specifically as a result, as a rule, of concrete actions by the United States. This applies equally to the Near East, Central America, southern Africa, or Afghanistan.

Primakov: In general U.S. political scientists have recently begun to devote increasing attention to the theory of the manipulation of conflict situations. This is clearly reflected in U.S. theoretical thinking, which originated the terms "management" entirely unconnected with the elimination of the conflicts or with finding means of resolving them.

Kobysh: The U.S. perception of the means of "management" of regional conflicts is indicated by an interview U.S. Senator Metzenbaum gave to Cleveland television. At a moment -- this was in early January -- when the whole world was worried about the tension created by U.S. actions over Libya, the U.S. senator came out openly and publicly with a proposal to organize an attempt to assassinate Libyan leader Al-Qadhdhafi. The senator was quite frank: "Perhaps we have reached the moment when Al-Qadhdhafi should be eliminated."

If the United States wants to resolve regional problems in this way, the conflicts will persist for a long time in a highly dangerous form. Although I must say that

the U.S. ruling class, as far as I know, is concerned about the situation in those so-called "hot spots." I was intrigued by the information which recently appeared in the Western press concerning conversations between U.S. leadership figures and a number of Latin American leaders about the situation now existing in Chile. These figures did not call, like Senator Metzenbaum, for the assassination of Pinochet, but they stated clearly that unless the present regime in Chile is "transformed," the emergence of a "Marxist state" in that South American republic is inevitable.

Primakov: That is to say, a certain section of the U.S. ruling circles is concerned about the "side effects" of their policy of installing right-wing antipopular regimes in particular countries. Many of the more realistically minded Americans are beginning to realize that this could prove very costly to the United States, since all this ultimately leads objectively to the consolidation of left-wing forces locally.

Kobysh: One important result of Geneva, as I understand it, is the progress toward the idea that real opportunities exist for both the Soviet Union and the United States to contribute to the elimination of dangerous regional conflicts. To this end it is necessary to stop exploiting these conflicts in the struggle against the Soviet Union. Naturally, the USSR's plans do not include the exploitation of any crisis situation against the United States. At the Geneva press conference M.S. Gorbachev said that security is indivisible today and that in our time you cannot build one state's security at the expense of another state, still less contrary to the interests of that other state's security. If this formula is extended to regional conflict situations, it would be possible, it seems to me, to reach agreement on a positive contribution by the two powers to the process of settling those conflicts.

Primakov: All the things we have discussed are not static problems, they are in motion. And doubtless we cannot regard the debate on any of them as completed. But if we have correctly identified the trend, then all the same, albeit slowly and with difficulty, the world will inevitably make its way to better times. The program set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's statement is mankind's route into the third millenium. It is only natural that this route, which guarantees the survival of civilization, was opened up by socialism.

/6091
CSO: 5200/1254

GORBACHEV OFFER EXAMINED; MAY SIGNAL BREAKTHROUGH

London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 30 Jan 86 p 18

[Article by David Adamson: "Side-Stepping Propaganda on the Road to Disarmament"]

[Text]

THERE is a danger that when the Western nuclear powers reply to the Gorbachev proposals of January 15 they will be less than forthright. They believe in nuclear weapons as permanent guarantors against a terminal third world war, and that, while it may be based on sensible arguments, will not be an easy case to argue in the court of public opinion when Mr Gorbachev is offering a vision of a world freed from nuclear weapons in 15 years.

The full Gorbachev statement contains a great deal of substance. It links conventional disarmament in Europe to nuclear disarmament and makes a strong pitch for Western European support. It is no accident, the statement admits frankly, that so many of the initiatives are addressed directly to Europe, whose citizens could have "a special mission (in) building détente anew". Mr Gorbachev may be attempting to drive a wedge between the United States and Europe, but what is most important about the statement is that it confirms there has been a tremendous climatic shift for the better across the whole chilly front of East-West arms negotiations.

If one stresses the need for honesty in the reply to Mr Gorbachev, it is because that quality has been absent from the recent responses to the Soviet moratorium on underground testing. It is not true that the problem of verifying Soviet compliance remains a major obstacle to an agreement that ends testing, which the Soviet Union proposes as a first step towards wider agreement.

Verification technology is well advanced in the West and the Soviet Union has offered on-site inspection in cases where a breach is suspected. "We state quite categorically that monitoring is not a problem for us," says Mr Gorbachev. In a tone that is a far cry from the remark of a Soviet negotiator in Geneva five years ago that "we are against giving absolute pre-eminence to verification and carrying it to absurd lengths." What is needed now is for the offer to be tested in negotiation to see if there is a change in substance as well as tone.

The difficulty for the United States and Britain (and France) is that they want to continue testing to perfect warheads for missiles that will last well beyond Mr Gorbachev's 15 year period. In Britain's case the weapon is the Trident missile whose sale to us by the Americans would be banned under the Gorbachev proposals. If you don't have nuclear missiles, you don't have deterrence, and Western security is based on a belief in the virtues of deterrence.

Another area in which problems of honesty may arise in the West's response—in this case, principally the American response—is that of President Reagan's vision of a world freed from the nuclear threat by a defensive system hung in space. It will be hard to convince world opinion that Star Wars is somehow an alternative to the Gorbachev proposal. For a start, the strategic defence initiative is officially described as strengthening nuclear deterrence, not ending it. Moreover, the most recent testing in Nevada has been an experiment using a nuclear explosion to generate laser beams capable of destroying missiles in flight, a development which has the potential for breaching the Outer Space Treaty as well as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

S D I may have been a splendidly successful means of getting the Soviet Union back to the Geneva negotiating tables, but it is going to get harder and harder to sell as an idea when Mr Gorbachev is pushing for an end to *all* nuclear weapons. Why spend countless billions of dollars on attempting to protect yourself against weapons which your enemy wants to abolish altogether? An American Congress struggling to eliminate a huge budget deficit in five years may not be immune to arguments of that sort.

Of course Mr Gorbachev's proposal is propagandist. Its time-

table is geared to obstructing the long lead-time for SDI and the introduction of new weapons by Britain and France. The call for parallel reductions in troops and conventional weapons in Central Europe and the constructive remarks about how to break the deadlock at the Stockholm conference on European security are aimed principally at West Germany. Just as the linkage in the preamble between the February party congress, improvements in the Soviet people's quality of life and the need for "a change for the better in the international arena" is meant to soothe Soviet ears with a ration of hope.

No doubt the Western response will also have its propagandist elements. There is nothing wrong with that so long as the goals are clear and the approach to them is honest. It should not be evasive and it should not rely heavily on a monotonous re-run of allegations that because the Soviet Union is supposed in some quarters to have broken existing treaties it can never be relied on to keep any treaties.

Trust is, of course, a difficulty when open societies are dealing with a closed and secretive society which broke the ground rules of the last détente when it invaded Afghanistan. No journalist or public figure in the Soviet Union is going to step forward and denounce a breach of agreement which the verification methods permitted by treaty have failed to identify. And even if the technical means of verification are deemed sound there is always the suspicion (noted by Prof. Allan (Krass*) that evidence of compliance has been planted to distract attention from sinister developments elsewhere: "In short, it is not what is seen which is worrisome; it is what is *not* seen."

One is into a world of nightmarish scenarios fostered by those who believe that evasion has become such an art that old-style treaties are no longer desirable. It is true, for example, that submarine-launched cruise missiles can be counted only by boarding and inspecting submarines. Some developments such as the new phased-array radars under construction by the Soviet Union and the United States are ambiguous: they can be used to monitor the other side's missile tests or they could be part of the command system for a Star Wars defence.

It would be foolish to bury these problems with wishful thinking, but many means of verification are effective. Seismic monitoring can pick up nuclear tests down to one kiloton, the lowest level relevant to military purposes. Verification and intelligence gathering are, of course, often inseparable and therefore cloaked in secrecy, but the detailed information which can be transmitted back from reconnaissance satellites carrying cameras and monitoring radio traffic and radar and other signals is enormous and steadily improving in quality.

If Mr Gorbachev really means what he says about on-site verification of nuclear and other disarmament and confidence-building agreements then we are on the verge of a breakthrough. One that is perhaps more important in political terms, because of its implications, than in military terms. It meets one of the requirements of a noted hard-liner, Mr Caspar Weinberger, the United States Defence Secretary, who has said, "We need on-site verification, which we've always offered, which the Soviet Union has always refused, which says quite a lot about the difference between the two societies."

With or without on-site verification, substantial cheating by the Soviet Union is unlikely. As another Defence Secretary, Mr Harold Brown, has pointed out it would soon be picked up (because it would have to be massive to tip the existing balance) and the political risks would hardly make it worthwhile. The response to Mr Gorbachev should be clear in setting out the West's belief that complete nuclear disarmament is not desirable in the foreseeable future. It could offer limits on the number of tests and expand on the offer to permit observers. It could develop President Reagan's "open laboratories" proposal for research into space weaponry. And, as has been suggested, the United States could at long last ratify the threshold test ban treaty (limiting the size of explosions) and the agreement on peaceful nuclear explosions, in both cases put off because of fears over verification. Step by step would seem to be the approach, and a first step could be Soviet acceptance in Stockholm this summer of an agreement opening up both sides' military activities in Europe to effective monitoring.

**Verification: How Much Is Enough?* By Allan S. Krass, Taylor and Francis, £25.

/9274
CSO: 5240/027

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET COMMENTARY ON REAGAN STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

TASS Cites PRAVDA Editorial

LD062311 Moscow TASS in English 2256 GMT 6 Feb 86

[Excerpt] Moscow, 7 Feb (TASS)--The newspaper PRAVDA today published an editorial commenting on the U.S. President's State of the Union Address, which says:

United States President Ronald Reagan made his State of the Union Address to Congress on February 4. According to tradition, the statement was slated for late January but was postponed due to the crash of the Challenger.

The State of the Union Address is a traditional analysis of the state of affairs in the United States and on the world arena, a review of the state's foreign and domestic policy. Proposing to speak "about our deepest longing for the future -- to leave our children a land that is free and just in a world at peace," Reagan declared, "It is my hope that our fireside summit in Geneva and Mr Gorbachev's upcoming visit to America can lead to a more stable relationship." He said that the American people hate war and are longing for peace.

In the following paragraph, however, the President noted the existence of "deep and abiding differences" with the Soviet Union, repeating the set of trite anti-Soviet stereotypes, and returning, in fact, to the discredited, bankrupt ideas of a "crusade" against socialism. Yet another claim about "the threat from Soviet forces, conventional and strategic, from the Soviet drive for domination" became a tribute to the outdated mode of thinking of the times of the cold war.

The reality is such, however, that the American leader needed the false, totally groundless accusations against the Soviet Union in order to provide a propaganda justification for the course towards a further unrestricted escalation of the arms race (allocations for specific military programmes, above all, the modernization of strategic strike forces in the new financial year, are planned to grow by 12 per cent, and by 42 per cent before 1991). One of the chief theses of the address is that America should and will arm itself, and that its course is the position-of-strength policy. In other words, the United States intends following the path which has already led mankind to an unprecedented arms race, to great disasters.

"Never has there been a more exciting time to be alive -- a time of rousing wonder and heroic achievement," the U.S. head of state said in his address. "Today, physicists peering into the infinitely small realms of sub-atomic particles... astronomers build a space telescope that can see to the edge of the universe and, possibly, back to the moment of creation."

But is the "star wars" programme which the President praised with enthusiasm in his address that is a real step towards a catastrophe [sentence as received]. The "security shield", as Reagan describes the Strategic Defence Initiative in his address, is, above all, a "nuclear sword", a "super-weapon" of the Pentagon which bets on achieving military superiority over the USSR by deploying strike weapons in outer space. As a matter of fact, they in Washington do not conceal that they have not abandoned the claims to victory in a nuclear conflict, endorsed in the programme for the 1984-1988 financial years.

In the State of the Union Address, Reagan mentions but in passing the major issue -- the Soviet-American talks on the vital problem of our time, that of ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear annihilation. The head of the White House does not even mention the accord, endorsed in the joint Soviet-American statement in Geneva, obliging the two sides to seek to attain the historic goal of preventing an arms race in outer space and terminating it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear armaments and strengthening strategic stability.

The U.S. President deliberately avoids even mentioning in his State of the Union Message the Soviet proposals advanced in Mikhail Gorbachev's January 15 statement, which sets out a concrete, stage-by-stage programme for a total elimination of nuclear weapons in the world, a programme of implementing the accords that emerged as a result of the Geneva summit meeting.

Speech Dwells on SDI

OW061243 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1115 GMT 5 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program, presented by G. Zubkov]

[Text] The United States must rearm, rapidly implementing SDI, with which it is known it would like to make its nuclear arsenals invulnerable and have its hands free for the first nuclear strike. That is the approach to the issue of war and peace expressed in President Reagan's speech at the joint session of both houses of the U.S. Congress. It was the traditional message on the State of the Union. In essence, the message bore the stamp of publicity and a promise to continue with the old policy to go ahead with the militarization of the country and the arms race, spreading it into space.

Conducting state terrorism abroad, assisting big business, and curtailing social programs in the country were not forgotten. True, the President expressed the hope that the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva and the planned visit to the United States by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev would, as he said, lead to more stable relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. But the U.S. President, as before, not only failed to give a reply to the latest most important Soviet initiatives, aimed at fully eliminating nuclear arms and preventing the militarization of space, but did not even utter a word about them.

No Comment on Arms Proposal

LD052231 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] President Reagan's message is noteworthy, in my view, not only for what is in it, but also, to no less degree, for what is not in it. Here, however paradoxically, there is literally no mention of the large-scale proposals on problems of disarmament, put forward in the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. As is known, since the publication of this very important document, which, by the way, has been distributed as official UN material, approximately 1 month has already passed. During that time many state and public figures of a number of countries, including ones belonging to NATO, have spoken out in support of the new, peace-loving proposals of the Soviet Union. The significance of the Soviet proposals, primarily on the elimination of nuclear weapons and, as a first step, on an immediate end to testing of nuclear weapons, has been noted at important international forums, in particular at the sessions of the Disarmament Conference, which have resumed in Geneva.

And what about Washington? At first they spoke here of the need to study the Soviet proposals. But has such a study not been delayed too long, if it was not mentioned even in the President's message to the Congress? After all, time will not wait. Many in the United States itself are pointing this out, especially since the Challenger catastrophe, which demonstrated particularly graphically the danger of any kind of power doctrines, both on earth and in space. But the fact of the matter is evidently that the highest echelons of power in the United States by no means want to part with such doctrines. For this presidential message to the Congress also clearly lays stakes on a certain power of the United States from its global interests on earth affecting, in particular, the sovereign states of Afghanistan and Angola, Cambodia and Nicaragua, to no less global interests in space, including not only the dash to the stars, but "star wars" as well.

However, in our nuclear missile age, banking on power is an extremely dangerous occupation.

It would seem that it has long been time to abandon the thinking of the Stone Age, when the main concern was to provide oneself with the biggest possible club and heaviest possible stone. The responsibility before the present and coming generations is now too great. I sought in vain for an expression of such a sense of responsibility in the message of the U.S. President.

Listeners 'Disappointed'

LD051926 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 5 Feb 86

[Excerpt] Washington, 5 Feb (TASS)--President Ronald Reagan has delivered a traditional address on the State of the Union at a joint meeting of the both houses of Congress. The message which was to prepare ground for submitting a draft federal budget for next financial year to Congress was of a pronounced publicity nature. It has disappointed those who expected that the President would analyse and suggest ways to solve the urgent problems which the United States encounters both inside the country and in the international arena.

The results of a public opinion poll taken by the ABC TV network and circulated the day before indicated that a considerable numer of Americans regard the threat of a nuclear war, U.S. economic troubles, poverty and unemployment as the major problems of our times. It is obvious that, taking those sentiments into account, the head of the White House said, in particular, that his "deepest longing for the future" is "to leave our children a land that is free and just in a world at peace". "It is my hope", he stated, "that our fireside summit in Geneva and Mr. Gorbachev's upcoming visit to America can lead to a more stable relationship".

At the same time Reagan not only failed to give a reply to the latest major Soviet initiatives which are aimed at reducing and then at completely eliminating nuclear arms, and at preventing militarisation of outer space, but did not say a word about them altogether.

The Washington administration's approach to the problems of war and peace has been defined in the State of the Union message by an old but by no means less dangerous formula: America should arm itself and pursue the position-of-strength policy. For lack of other arguments in favour of spending huge funds for non-productive and dangerous military purposes, Reagan again turned to the myth about a "Soviet threat". He asserted that the threat from Soviet forces, conventional and strategic, and from the Soviet drive for domination remains great.

President Reagan advocated a build-up of U.S. military might, an intensification of the arms race, including its spreading over to outer space through the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) which envisages the deployment of strike weapons in outer space and is aimed at creating a first-nuclear-strike capability. "The same technology transforming our lives can solve the greatest problem of the 20th century", the President assured. "A security shield can one day render nuclear weapons obsolete and free mankind from the prison of nuclear terror". How distant such kind of promises are from actuality is evidenced, in particular, by the fact that the Pentagon in its request for the 1987 financial year, along with the speeding up of the SDI, envisages a sharp increase, not a cutdown, in appropriations for the production of the newest types of offensive strategic arms.

Moreover, Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger directly points out in the annual report to the Congress that the SDI should become one of the pillars of the American "nuclear factor". This means that the Washington strategists regard the SDI programme as a component of the efforts being made by the United States to break the existing strategic balance for the purpose of gaining military superiority.

/9738
CSO: 2500/1255

TASS: U.S. CONGRESSMAN URGES PROGRESS ON ARMS TALKS

LD092153 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 9 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 9 TASS -- Dante Fascell, Democrat, Florida, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, has urged the U.S. Administration to work for progress at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. Speaking in Congress on Thursday, he said that the administration should make its top priority at this stage the speediest reaching of an agreement with the USSR on a complete and general ban of nuclear weapons testing. As Dante Fascell said, later this month the House of Representatives will vote on a resolution demanding a ban on nuclear testing, which has been co-sponsored by 208 congressmen.

He recalled that earlier voting on that resolution, which was originally planned for October last year, had been postponed at the request of the administration, which said that the adoption of the resolution would "undermine" Washington's stand at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

The legislator pointed out that a ban on nuclear testing is one of the main aspects of the Soviet Union's latest peace proposals. Dante Fascell urged the administration to observe the SALT-2 treaty of 1972 on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile defence systems; to work for a ban on the chemical weapons and also reach agreement with the USSR on the verification and control of observance of the agreements.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

SOVIET SCIENTISTS APPEAL TO U.S. COLLEAGUES

PM081853 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

["Soviet Scientists' Appeal to U.S. Scientists" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Follows the full text of Soviet scientists' address to U.S. scientists:

Esteemed colleagues,

We, Soviet scientists, address an insistent call to you to make a real contribution to ridding humanity, stage-by-stage, of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, a concrete program for whose complete elimination by the year 2000 has been set out in detail in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, 1986.

We, scientists, are, perhaps, more aware than people of other professions about what nuclear arms stockpiling is fraught with. At every new spiral of the arms race, the military-strategic balance and the international situation as a whole become less stable, the danger of an accidental outbreak of nuclear war increases. Therefore, we welcome the statement of the Soviet and U.S. leaders in Geneva that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought, that any war between the Soviet Union and the United States, whether nuclear or conventional, must be prevented.

We hold that the problem of saving human civilization and mankind itself from destruction is the pivot of the common interests of countries, regardless of their ideology and the social and political system. Disarmament, the consolidation of strategic stability, the prevention of international conflicts and crises is a common and joint task. Therefore, the stage-by-stage implementation of the program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction before the end of the current century everywhere, of the consistent lowering of the level of military confrontation can and must become such a joint undertaking.

Nuclear disarmament is central to the new Soviet program. At the same time it proposes the elimination not only of nuclear means, but also other weapons of mass destruction and prevention of the emergence of new ones. Of special importance are the proposals to eliminate such barbarous weapons as chemical ones and to ban the development [sozdaniye] of non-nuclear means based on new physical principles, whose destructive capacity is close to that of nuclear or other means of mass destruction. It is also proposed to reduce conventional arms and armed forces, to adopt concerted measures for confidence-building, to ensure a reliable security in Europe, Asia, and other areas of the world, to save through disarmament considerable funds to be switched to the improvement of the living conditions of people.

We also call your attention, esteemed colleagues, to the fact that the Soviet leadership decided to extend for three months the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions. It is important that all other nuclear powers, above all the United States, should join in this moratorium, that agreement on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests be concluded. The ending of the testing would arrest the process of the upgrading of nuclear weapons.

We hold that the program for the elimination of nuclear weapons is feasible only if all kinds of space arms are banned.

The important condition for the elimination of nuclear arms, as it is stressed in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement, is the implementation of large-scale measures of effective control [kontrol] over arms limitation, reduction, and elimination. Concrete agreements on disarmament must be verified [kontrolirovatsya] by both national technical means and on-site inspections [proverka], as well as through international procedures.

Undelayed pooling of the efforts of all peoples, their scientific and technical potential is needed for eradicating famine, poverty, diseases, and ensuring environmental protection and the supply of energy and raw materials to industry. Mankind is on the threshold of great leaps in space exploration which requires large-scale international cooperation. What is ahead is a more intensive use of near-earth space for the needs of economic development and science, exploration of planets of the solar system, and many other things. But these possibilities can be realized only if there are no weapons in space, no matter what functions these weapons are said to have.

Scientists play a considerable role in the radical improvement of the world situation, in the solution of fundamental problems of the present on which nuclear disarmament depends. Their knowledge and experience, their dedication to humanistic ideals must assist in every possible way the transition to a world without nuclear arms in relatively short, but realistic historical periods. We call on you, esteemed U.S. colleagues, for cooperation in the noble domain of the protection of man's sacred right, the right to live. The road is open to ridding humanity of the burden of weapons of mass destruction, of the fear of nuclear disaster. The scientists' moral duty compels them to declare honesty and clearly where the world should be advancing -- whether toward creating [sozdaniye] ever new kinds of deadly weapons increasing the danger of mutually destructive conflict or along the road of the limitation of the arms race and subsequent disarmement, of the creation of a new system of security, durable peace, and broad international cooperation to the benefit of humanity.

The address has been signed by the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Soviet Scientists' Committee in Defence of Peace and Against Nuclear Threat, the Scientific Council for the Study of Peace and Disarmament Problems.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1255

BRIEFS

GORBACHEV STATEMENT RELEASED AT UN--New York, 29 Jan (TASS)--The text of a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on questions of disarmament of January 15, 1986, has been released at the United Nations as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1648 GMT 29 Jan 86 LD] /9738

DELHI STATEMENT ON PROPOSAL AT UN--New York, 6 Feb (TASS)--The Delhi statement of the Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security issues gives a high appraisal and supports the statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who has put forward a programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. The commission's statement has been circulated as an official document of the UN General Assembly and the Security Council. The document points out that Mikhail Gorbachev's statement is far-reaching and constructive one which deserves the most serious consideration. It emphasizes the need to prevent an arms race in outer space and to end it on earth and urges the states possessing nuclear weapons to observe a mutual and verifiable moratorium on nuclear weapon testing. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2352 GMT 5 Feb 86 LD] /9738

NEW YORK TIMES CARRIES GORBACHEV STATEMENT--New York, 5 Feb (TASS)--THE NEW YORK TIMES has carried the full text of a statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January, in which he presented proposals on the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in the world by the year 2000. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 5 Feb 86 LD] /9738

CONSULTATIONS IN HAGUE ON INITIATIVE--The Hague, 7 Feb (TASS)--Consultations on disarmament questions that have recently been posed by the Soviet Union have been held at the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The participants were A. Jacobovits de Szeged, general director for political affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; A.I. Blatov, the Soviet ambassador to the Netherlands; and S.B. Chetverikov, USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs special representative. Talks were also held at the foreign affairs commission of the Netherlands Parliament second chamber, the board of the ruling Christian Democratic Appeal party, and the Institute of International Relations in the Hague. During these talks there was a detailed explanation of the contents of the initiatives put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January 1986. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1921 GMT 7 Feb 86 LD] /9738

SHEVARDNADZE, HARTMAN DISCUSS ARMS PROPOSALS--Moscow, 4 Feb (TASS)--Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Minister of foreign affairs, today received Arthur Hartman, U.S. ambassador to Moscow, at the latter's request. Certain matters of Soviet-U.S. relations were discussed during the conversation. Eduard Shevardnadze drew the ambassador's attention to the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which set out a specific program with a carefully planned timetable for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons, with a ban on strike weapons in space. The hope was expressed that the U.S. side will not delay giving an answer to our important proposals, which provide a way out of the nuclear deadlock and, specifically, will follow the example of the USSR and join, while there is still time, our extended moratorium on any nuclear explosions. This would be a major step on the road to implementing the task of nuclear disarmament. It was stressed that if the U.S. Administration makes use of this new opportunity, it would understandably create a favorable background for the meeting of the highest leaders of our two countries. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Feb 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1255 - END -